

UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH



Dar. Rm.
BX7101
S7
V. 3

LIBRARIES



THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS,

FOR THE YEAR

1830.

—
VOL. III.
—

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY PEIRCE AND PARKER,
Successors to Peirce & Williams,
NO. 9, CORNHILL.

REPORT OF THE PHILADELPHIA

THE PHILADELPHIA

THE PHILADELPHIA

VOL. III.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY SEABOARD AND PARKER

Successors to Lewis & Williams

No. 2 CORNHILL

INDEX.

Adams Mr. of Roxbury, Extract from	660	Haven Mr. Extract from	658
Albert Von Haller	62	Henry Matthew Account of	237
American Education Society	303	Heresy Remarks on	364
Amusements	44, 601	Hilliard M. r. Extract from	660
Apostolic Fathers on the Divinity of Christ	290	Hope of Future Repentance	126
Appleton M. r. Extract from	656	Hopkins Dr. Samuel Account of	554
Barnard Dr. Extract from	661	Hopkinson Judge, Remarks on his Letter	294
Beecher Dr. in Reply to the Christian Examiner	17, 72, 181	Howard Dr. Extract from	659
Biblical Illustrations	106	Indians, their Rights Vindicated	141, 492, and 517
Boston Recorder	437	Infidelity what constitutes	1, 8, 447
Byles Dr. Extract from	658	Infidels English Extracts from	2
Calvin Biographical Sketch of	559, 615	Inspiration of the Scriptures	369
Calvin's treatment of Servetus	615 621	Jacobi Henry	64
Calvinists not believe that Infants are damned	23, 72, 181	Jews Creed from Lightfoot	377
Celsus testifies to the divinity of Christ	234	Jews Milman's History of	480
Channing Dr. on Associations	129	Jonah's History Defence of	161
" " on Revivals of Religion	131	Justin Martyr on the Divinity of Christ	344
" " on Missions	132	Knapp's Greek Testament	440
" " on the Sabbath	135	Lathrop Dr. Extract from	659
Chauncy Dr. Extracts from	652	Liberalists admit the Orthodoxy of the Scriptures	457
Cherokees, their Improvements	144	Lucian's account of Early Christians	223
Christians Early, opinions of respecting the Trinity	225, 287, 344	Mayhew Dr. Extract from	657
Christian Liberty	380	Mosheim's Sermons	667
Christian Fathers on Inspiration	441	Natural Affections not Holiness	169, 236
Christian Examiner on Universalism	357	Natural History of Enthusiasm Extracts from	330
" " on Inspiration	420	Neander's Church History Extracts from	230
Christianity Nature, Certainty and Evidence of	414	Newton Sir Isaac not a Unitarian	281
Churches Rights of	506, 540, 610, 649	Orthodox Treatment of in Massachusetts	645
Claudius Mathias	63	Osgood Dr. Extract from	661
Convention of Congregational Ministers	248	Paley's Change of Sentiments	381
Consociations Remarks on	606	Pemberton Dr. Extract from	657
Conversion of President Edwards	35	Pilgrims Character of	631
" " of William Cowper	37	Protestants Faith of in Inspiration of the Scriptures	591
" " of David Brainard	38	Recent Publications 49, 109, 167, 335, 391, 444, 551, 578, 612	
" " of Dr. Samuel Hopkins	39	Remarks on Isaiah vii. 14	404, 460
" " of Andrew Fuller	40	Sennabier's Account of Calvin and Servetus	621
" " of Samuel J. Mills	42	Sentiments of former Ministers in and around Boston	651
Culture Moral and Intellectual	572	Separations among Congregationalists	541
Darracott Ridson account of	86	Smith Dr. Adam Extract from	604
Death-bed Repentance Inefficacy of	511	Stollburg Count	63
Death-bed Scenes	623	Sullivan late Governor Letter from	458
Dr. Dinter	70	System in Religious Charities Benefits of	567
Disappointment in the Last Day	337	Tappan Dr. Extract from	662
Dyspepsy Remarks on	575	Thatcher Dr. Extract from	659
Education Reporter	437	The Theatre	597
Education Societies account of	301	Transubstantiation and the Trinity	379
Elliot Dr. Extract from	656	Unitarians Infidelity of Some	10, 424, 549
Elocution Remarks on	314, 359	call the Germans Infidels	451
Emmons' Dr. Sermons	594	deny the Scriptures to be a Revelation	95
Eternal Death	467	deny the Inspiration of the Scriptures	424
French Mr. Extract from	660	their Views of the Old Testament	102, 544
Gay Mr. Extract from	658	have concealed their Sentiments	113, 443, 446, 549
Geneva State of at Different periods	163	most of them Universalists	210, 548
Germany Decline, Revival, and Present State of Evangelical Religion in	57	Inconsistencies of	394
German Rationalists	453	Unitarianism present State of in England	279
Good Dr. Account of	196		
Griesbach's Greek Testament	438		
Hamann John G.	63		
Harvard University, Accounts of the late Treasurer of	25		
Harvard University shall I send my Son to	323, 388		

Unitarianism in New England, Letters on the Introduction and Progress of	113, 394, 503
Unitarianism, Political influence of in Massachusetts	612
Unitarianism, Facts relative to its early Propagation in Massachusetts	665
Unitarian Ministrations in England	533
Unitarian Advocate, Notice of	547, 606
Universalism defined	208
“ Christian Examiner on	387
Wegscheider Account of	452
West Dr. of Stockbridge, Biographical Sketch of	382
West Dr. of New Bedford, Letter from to Gov. Sullivan	460
West Dr. of Boston, Extract from	655
West Dr. Letter from	669
Willard President Extract from	659
Youth Irreligious Character and Misyery of	47
Zollikofer, Notice of his Sermons	59
INDEX OF REVIEWS.	
Review of Publications by Rev. Parsons Cooke	24, 641
Memoirs of Ridson Darracott	86
An Article in the Christian Examiner for January, 1830	95
The first settlers of New England. By a Lady of Massachusetts	102
Dr. Channing on Associations	129
Review of an Article in the North American Review on the Removal of the Indians	141
Memoirs of the late John Mason Good, M. D.	196
A Sermon by Rev. Hosea Bal-lou, entitled, Commendation and Reproof of Unitarians	205
Memoirs of the Rev. Matthew Henry	237
Christian Essays, by Rev. Samuel Charles Wilks, A. M.	243
an Historical Sketch of the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts	248
The National History of Enthusiasm	256
Publications on Education Societies	301
Dr. Porter's Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery	314, 359
Dr. Wood's Lectures on Inspiration	369
an Article in the Christian Examiner on the Nature and Extent of Inspiration	420
Dr. Sprague's Lectures to young people	470
Milman's History of the Jews	480
Speeches on the Indian Bill	492, 517

Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London, Westminster and Southwark	532
Professor Hitchcock's Lectures on Diet, Regimen and Employment	576
Dr. Hopkin's Sermon on the Importance of Considering Christ in his high and glorious Character	582
Dr. Wisner's History of the Old South Church in Boston; and of Dr. Hawes Tribute to the memory of the Pilgrims	630

INDEX OF CRITICAL NOTICES.

Notice of Blaisdale's Lessons in Intellectual Philosophy	49
Blunt's Veracity of the Gospels	50
Macarius, or Memoirs of a Naval Officer	51
Essays by William Penn on the Rights of the Indians	51
Dr. Skinner's Sermon on the Death of Mr. Bruen	52
Dr. Wisner's Sermon before the Society for Propagating the Gospel	54
Miss Beecher's Suggestions on Education	109
Dr. Tyler's Strictures on Articles in the Christian Spectator	110
Mr. Malcom's Bible Dictionary	111
Mr. Ide's Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Hixon	112
The Works of President Edwards	280
Wardlaw's Discourses on Prayer	335
Dr. Channing's Election Sermon	392
Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing	444
Dr. Wood's Letters to Dr. Taylor	501
The Political Class Book	501
President Allen's Dudleian Lecture	502
The Christian Examiner for September, 1830	539
The Unitarian Advocate for September, 1830	547
Mr. Furness' Apology for the Jews	551
Mr. Palfrey on the Use of Poisoned Drinks	552
Mr. Dwight on the Evidences of being a child of God	553
Mr. Ferguson's Memoirs of Dr. Hopkins	554
An Exhibition of Unitarianism, in quotations from its Standard Authors and Works	557
Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays on Future Punishment	613
President Quincy's Centennial Address.	614





LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

JANUARY, 1830.

NO. I.

COMMUNICATIONS.

WHAT CONSTITUTES INFIDELITY?

It is desirable that writers on religious subjects should carefully avoid two extremes : The one is, injuriously calling hard names, or bestowing without reason reproachful epithets ; the other, a squeamish dread of calling persons and things by their proper names. The first of these indicates a malicious temper, always injurious to the cause in which it is indulged, and specially unbecoming on the subject of religion. The latter evinces a want of earnestness in promoting and defending truth, and a greater fear of him who can only kill the body, than of him who can destroy both body and soul in hell.

Some leading Unitarians have, of late, been denominated Infidels ; or they have been charged with holding principles in regard to the Bible which amount to a virtual infidelity. If this charge is unfounded, they ought not to lie under it. The charge, in this case, ought never to have been made, and ought now to be retracted. But, on the other hand, if the charge is true, the public certainly ought to know it. They ought to understand the grounds on which it rests, and the reasons and motives of those who have urged it. It is proposed, therefore, to consider at this time the following inquiry : *What makes a man an Infidel ? or, What constitutes Infidelity ?*

1. It is obvious that a man may be an infidel, without *avowedly rejecting Christianity*. It is doubtful whether one of the old English Deists ever made such an avowal.

“ Lord Herbert declared that he had *no intention to attack Christianity*, which he calls the best religion.” “ He represents it as the great design of the Gospel, of all its doctrines, and of the rites and sacraments there enjoined, to establish those great principles in which he makes religion properly to consist.”*

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. v, p. 59, Leland's Deistical writers, vol. i. p. 5.

Hobbes, in some instances, manifests a high respect for the sacred writings. "He acknowledges that the writings of the New Testament are as ancient as the times of the apostles; that they were written by persons who lived in those times, some of whom saw the things which they relate;" and that "they are the *true registers* of those things which were done and said by the prophets and apostles." "He is persuaded," he says, "that they (the early Christians) *did not falsify the Scriptures*; because, if they had had an intention to do so, they would have made them more favorable to their power over Christian princes, and civil sovereignty, than they are."*

Blount, who did little more than revive the system of Lord Herbert, acknowledges "that it is not safe to trust to Deism alone, if Christianity be not joined with it." "Undoubtedly," says he, "in our travels to the other world, the common road is the safest; and though Deism is a good manuring of a man's conscience, yet certainly, if *sowed with Christianity*, it will produce the most plentiful crop."†

Toland insists, "that it was not his intention to invalidate, but to *illustrate and confirm* the canon of the New Testament."‡

Lord Shaftsbury used to declare himself "a very orthodox believer," insisting "that *he faithfully embraced the holy mysteries of our religion*, notwithstanding their amazing depth." He wrote a preface to a volume of sermons by Dr. Whichcot, in which "*he finds fault* with those in this profane age who represent not only the institution of preaching, but the *gospel itself* and *our holy religion to be a fraud*. He expresses the hope, that from some things in these sermons, they who are prejudiced against Christianity may be induced to like it the better," and that "such as are already Christians will prize it the more."||

Collins sometimes "speaks of Christianity with respect."§ In his Letter to Dr. Rogers, p. 112, he represents "the cause in which he was engaged, as the cause of virtue, learning, truth, God, religion, and *Christianity*."

Tindal says that "Christianity, stripped of the additions that policy, mistakes, and the circumstances of time have made to it, is a *most holy religion*, and that *all its doctrines plainly speak themselves to be the will of an infinitely wise and good God*."¶

Morgan represents, "our Saviour's doctrines" as "the true and genuine principles of nature and reason," and insists that men ought to be "thankful to God for the light of the Gospel."**

Chubb "was the author of a great many tracts, in some of which he put on the appearance of a *friend to Christianity*." One of the most remarkable of his tracts was entitled, "*The true Gospel of*

* Leland's Deistical writers, vol. i. pp. 36, 65.

† Leland's Deistical writers vol. i. pp. 54, 62.

** Moral Philosopher, vol. i. p. 145.

‡ *ibid.* p. 45.

§ *ibid.* p. 95.

‡ *ibid.* p. 50.

¶ *ibid.* p. 126.

Christ asserted." He does not doubt "that there was such a person as Jesus Christ, and that he, in the main, did and taught as is recorded of him." "The writings of the apostles contain excellent cautions, advices and instructions, which serve for the right conducting of our affections and actions."*

Lord Bolingbroke asserts, that "the system of religion which Christ published, and his evangelists recorded, is a *complete system* to all the purposes of religion, natural and revealed." Again, "Christianity, as it stands in the Gospel, contains not only a complete, but a very *plain* system of religion. It is, in truth, the system of *natural religion*; and such it might have continued, to the unspeakable advantage of mankind, if it had been propagated with the same simplicity with which it was originally taught by Christ himself."—"The gospel is in all cases one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice, benevolence, and universal charity."†

Hume, in the conclusion of his essay on Miracles, says that the reasoning there employed "may serve to confound those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion, who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. Our *most holy religion* is founded on *faith*, not on reason; and it is a sure method of exposing it to put it to such a trial as it is by no means fitted to endure."

Gibbon does not "deny the truth of Christianity." So far from this, he speaks of it as "the *divine revelation*," and says that its success was primarily "owing to the convincing evidence of the doctrine itself, and to the ruling providence of its *Great Author*."‡

The writers here mentioned are among those who, by common consent, have long been denominated Deists or Infidels. It will be understood, of course, that they frequently express sentiments which, to ordinary minds, seem very inconsistent with the declarations above quoted. It is no uncommon thing for the advocates of error, in *this* enlightened age, to be inconsistent with themselves. But it is evident, from what has been said, that they claimed to believe and respect the Gospel. They talked of its excellent morality, and of its divine author. Instead of regarding themselves as infidels, some among them insisted that they were the most consistent Christians. They were only clearing away the rubbish by

* Leland's Deistical writers, vol. i. pp. 214, 227, 228.

† See Bolingbroke's Works, vol. iv. pp. 188, 314, 316.

‡ Priestley's Church History, vol. vi. p. 366, and Gibbon's History vol. i. p. 536.

Even Byron sometimes speaks of the Bible with veneration, and of those as "thrice happy," who embrace it.

"Within this awful volume lies,
The mystery of mysteries!
Thrice happy they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace,
To read, to mark, to learn, to pray,
To lift the latch, and force their way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn."

which the Gospel had been obscured, and laboring to restore it to its pristine purity.* It is said expressly by Dr. Priestley, that “before the French revolution, hardly any person in England, or on the continent, *avowed himself an unbeliever in writing.*”† It is plain, therefore, that men may be infidels without avowedly and formally rejecting Christianity.

2. A person may be an infidel, and still not treat the character of the Saviour with open irreverence or disrespect. Most of the English Deists whose names have been mentioned, if not all of them, professed to admire the character of the Saviour. They believed there was such a person as Jesus Christ, and that he lived, taught, labored, and suffered, much as is represented in the Gospel. Morgan, “in many passages, speaks *very honorably of Jesus Christ*, and of the religion he introduced, as having brought clearer discoveries of our duty, and enforced it by stronger motives, and provided more effectual aids, than ever was done before. Accordingly, he expressly declared himself to be a Christian, on the foot of the New Testament.”‡ Chubb, in the conclusion of his Farewell to his readers, has the following declarations: “If any say that what I have written is out of disrespect to the person and ministry of Jesus Christ, the accusation is *false.*” “As upon the Christian scheme, Jesus Christ will be the judge of quick and dead, I assure my readers that in this view, I have no disagreeable apprehensions, on account of anything that I have published to the world.”

Lord Bolingbroke “pretends that the New Testament consisteth of two Gospels, the one published by our Saviour himself, and recorded by the evangelists; the other by St. Paul;” and while he rejects and inveighs against the latter, he professes to receive and *admire* the former.||

The testimony of the arch-infidel Rosseau to the character of the Saviour is probably familiar to many of my readers. “Is it possible that he, whose history the Gospel records, should be himself a mere man? Is this the style of an enthusiast, or of an ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity, in his manners! What affecting grace in his instructions! What elevation in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind, what delicacy, what justness in his replies! What empire over his passions! When Plato paints his imaginary just man, covered with all the ignominy of guilt, and deserving all the honors of virtue, he paints Jesus Christ in every stroke of his pencil. What prejudice, what blindness must they have, who

* Tindal and Morgan honored themselves and their followers with the appellation of *Christian Deists*; and stigmatized all others as *Christian Jews*—the advocates of an “Historical, political, clerical, mechanical faith and religion.” Leland, vol. i. p. 153.

† Church History vol. vi. p. 367.

‡ Leland's Deistical Writers, vol. i. pp. 147, 232.

|| Leland's Deistical Writers, vol. ii. p. 185.

dare to draw a comparison between the son of Sophroniscus and the son of Mary! What distance is there between the one and the other! If the life and death of Socrates are those of a philosopher, the life and death of Jesus Christ are those of a God.”*

3. A person may be an infidel, and still admit that the Scriptures contain a *revelation from God*, and that particular portions are of *divine inspiration*.

“Lord Herbert did not pretend to deny the *divinity* of the Gospel.”†

Hobbes “seems sometimes to acknowledge inspiration to be a *supernatural gift*, and the *immediate hand of God*.” He declares that though the laws of nature are not laws, as they proceed from nature, yet, “as *they are given by God in holy Scripture*, they are properly called laws; for *the holy Scripture is the voice of God*, ruling all things by the greatest right.”‡

Tindal, in a passage already quoted, says that all the doctrines of the Gospel “plainly speak themselves to be *the will of an infinitely wise and holy God*.”

Morgan often speaks of “the light of *revelation*.” “He seems expressly to acknowledge the great usefulness of divine revelation in general, and of the *Christian revelation* in particular.”||

Dodwell represents “the divine law” as “*first dictated by the Holy Spirit*;”§ and Chubb, in his posthumous works, acknowledges repeatedly “the *divine mission of Christ*.” He says that by Christianity, he means “that *revelation of God’s will* which Christ was, in a special and particular manner, sent to acquaint the world with; and, as far as the writings of the apostles are consonant with it, they come under the denomination of Christianity.”¶

Lord Bolingbroke says that “genuine Christianity *was taught of God*.” Again: “Christianity, as *it came out of the hands of God*, if I may use the expression, was a most simple and intelligible rule of belief, worship, and manners,—which is the true notion of a religion.” “The Christian system of faith and practice was *revealed by God himself*; and it is absurd and impious to assert, that the *divine Logos revealed it incompletely or imperfectly*. Its simplicity and plainness showed, that it was designed to be the religion of mankind, and manifested likewise *the divinity of its original*.” “Genuine Christianity is contained in the

* Mr. Jefferson, who, as appears from his works lately published, was a determined infidel, stooping even to the scurrility and vulgarity of Paine, yet strangely pretends to respect the character of Jesus, speaks of him as an illustrious “reformer,” and of his precepts as constituting “the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man.” vol. iv. p. 223.

† Mosheim’s Ecc. Hist., vol. v. p. 59.

‡ Leland’s Deistical Writers, vol. i. pp. 35, 36.

§ Christianity not founded on Argument, p. 112.

|| *ibid.* p. 146.

¶ Vol. ii. p. 346.

Gospel: It is the *word of God*. It requires, therefore, our veneration, and strict conformity to it.”*

Gibbon, as I have already shown, speaks of Christianity as “the *divine revelation*,” and of the Supreme Being as “its *great Author*.”

4. A person may be an infidel, and yet be a *professor* of the Christian religion, and an *observer of its ordinances*. Hobbes “professed to be of the church of England, and used to receive the sacrament among her sons.” When Collins was made “a justice of the peace, he received the sacrament as a qualifying test.” “Toland always professed himself a Christian.”† Morgan and Woolston were originally clergymen, the one a dissenter, and the other of the established church. They were, of course, professors of religion, and never publicly renounced their profession. Lord Bolingbroke speaks in the most respectful manner of the Christian sacraments, and, without doubt, he partook of them. “No institutions can be imagined more simple, nor more void of all those pompous rites and theatrical representations that abounded in the religious worship of the heathens and Jews, than these two [baptism and the Lord’s supper] were in their origin. They were not only innocent but profitable ceremonies; because they were extremely proper to keep up the spirit of true natural religion, by keeping up that of Christianity, and to promote the observance of moral duties, by maintaining a respect for the revelation which confirmed them.”‡

Voltaire “always professed himself a Christian, and continued to do so upon his death-bed.”||

5. A person may be an infidel, and yet pretend much *zeal* for the Christian religion. This was the case in regard to Woolston. “He declares that he is the *farthest of any man* from being engaged in the cause of infidels or deists; and that he writes, not for the service of infidelity, which has no place in his heart, but *for the honor of the holy Jesus*, and in *defence of Christianity*.” He concludes several of his discourses by declaring, that his “design is, the advancement of the truth, and of *the Messiahship of the holy Jesus, to whom be glory forever, Amen*.”

* Works, vol. iv. pp. 349, 394, 451, 631.

† Hist. of Dissenters, vol. iii. pp. 252, 253.

‡ Works, vol. iv. pp. 301, 302.

|| Hist. of Dissenters, vol. iii. p. 256.

Avowed unbelievers, or deists, are now claiming admission to the *churches* of Unitarians in England, and their reception is warmly and publicly advocated. The following is from a letter of the Rev. Dr. Sprague of Albany, dated Manchester, (England,) April 7th, 1828:—“There is in last Saturday’s paper, published here, a curious extract of a sermon, preached on the preceding Sabbath, by one of the Unitarian ministers of this town, *VINDICATING AN AMALGAMATION OF UNITARIANS AND DEISTS*, and *censuring*, as *illiberal*, those who exclude a man from their charity, because he happens to differ from them on so small a point, as *the divine authority of the Bible*. I am credibly informed that this fact is *quite in unison with the character of nearly ALL their congregations*; and that the question in respect to the divine authority of revelation is regarded by most of them as an *unimportant matter*.”

Yet, under the pretence of exalting a supposed internal and mystical sense of Scripture by depreciating the literal sense, he asserts that the Gospels "are full of impossibilities, incredibilities, and gross absurdities; that they are like Gulliverian tales of persons and things that, out of the romance, never had a being; that neither the fathers, the apostles, nor Jesus himself, meant that his miracles should be taken in the literal, but in the mystical and parabolical sense."*

In 1742, Mr. Dodwell published his famous pamphlet, entitled "Christianity not founded on Argument." Under the appearance of *great zeal* for the Christian religion, he endeavors to show that this religion has no foundation in reason or argument, but rests on "a constant, particular *revelation*, imparted separately and supernaturally to every individual." "The Holy Ghost," says he, "irradiates the souls of believers at once, with an irresistible light from heaven, that flashes conviction in a moment; so that their faith is completed in an instant, and the most perfect and finished creed produced, without any tedious process in deductions of their own." He quotes the Scriptures in proof of this strange doctrine, and offers up prayers for the friend to whom he writes, that "God would illuminate and irradiate his mind with a perfect and thorough conviction of *the truth of his holy Gospel*."†

Lord Bolingbroke speaks also of his *zeal* for Christianity. "Since I have said so much on the subject, in *my zeal for Christianity*, I will add this further: The resurrection of letters was a fatal period. The Christian system has been attacked, and wounded too very severely, since that time."‡

The facts and testimonies adduced under the foregoing particulars, have materially narrowed the question in debate, and given it additional point and interest: For if persons may not only pretend to embrace Christianity, to revere the character of its Author, and to receive its records as, to some extent, of divine original, but may come to its ordinances, and profess a zeal for its purity and advancement, and yet, by common consent, be denominated infidels; the question returns, with prodigious force, What makes a man an infidel? What constitutes infidelity? What are the characteristic marks, by which to distinguish between an infidel and a Christian?

To these inquiries, the following, it is believed, is the only proper answer: *The Christian receives the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as coming from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of his faith, and the rule of his conduct;—but the infidel, whatever he may profess or pretend, never in reality does this.*—The intelligent Christian is not

* Leland's Deistical Writers, vol. i. pp. 114, 115.

† pp. 89, 112.

‡ Works, vol. i. p. 182.

averse to sober and just criticism, in application to the Scriptures. He wishes the canon of Scripture to be investigated and established, and that whatever is included in the canon may be properly explained. He wishes to possess a *correct copy*, if possible, as the inspired writers left it; and he wishes this copy to be correctly interpreted, if possible according to 'the mind of the Spirit.' But when all this is done to his satisfaction, he has no further questions to ask. *He receives it all.* He says, with Chillingworth in his better days, "No demonstration can be stronger than this: *God hath said so, therefore it is true.*"

But the infidel is not satisfied with having a correct copy of the Scriptures, and with having it correctly interpreted. He does not then bow to it, as a standard. There is a certain part of it, if not the whole, which, in his estimation, is *not the authoritative word of God.*

Produce any passage to the believer, satisfy him that it belongs to the canon, and is correctly interpreted, and he receives it. But produce certain passages to the infidel, and if he cannot throw them out of the canon, or explain them away, he will not hesitate to tell you that the writers, in these instances, were mistaken, or that they did not mean what they said, having intentionally accommodated themselves to the prevailing opinions, the superstitious notions, of those around them.

The true believer receives the canonical Scriptures as a revelation from God. He believes, with the apostle, that 'the prophecy came not, in old time, by the will of man; but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' The infidel, on the contrary, does not regard the canonical books as a revelation. Some do not believe that a revelation has been made. Others admit that there has been a revelation, but the Bible is only a *history* of it—such a narrative *respecting* it, as honest, well meaning, but ignorant and prejudiced men have given us; so that in reading it, we must make due allowances, and beware that we do not mistake the ignorance of men for the revelations of God.

The true Christian believes that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' But the infidel, often, does not believe that *any* Scripture is the fruit of a supernatural inspiration. At most, he believes that only a *part* of the sacred volume is entitled to be thus regarded, and in determining what this part is, as it is wholly undefined, every one must consider and judge for himself. Whatever strikes any person agreeably, as reasonable in itself, and worthy of God, he is entitled to regard as the word of God; but whatever strikes him in a different manner, he may properly reject as no part of the revelation.

The true Christian believes, that the inspiration of the sacred writers secured them from all mistakes and errors, and led them to communicate the most important things in the most proper way. But the infidel, if he does not deny the inspiration of these writers altogether, supposes that they have committed frequent blunders, and must be judged of, as to the accuracy of their statements and reasonings, just like any other men.

In endeavoring to establish a point with the Christian, you may, with propriety, adduce proof from the Bible; for the Bible is to him an acknowledged standard. He will admit the force of any passage, which he can be satisfied belongs to the Bible, and which can be made properly to bear on the subject. But in endeavoring to establish a point with the infidel, to adduce such proof will be of no avail. Suppose you do this. Suppose you quote a passage, confessedly not an interpolation, and which, in its plain, acknowledged meaning, meets the point in debate. He will, perhaps, tell you, that he has no confidence in the Scriptures. Or if he hesitates to say as much as this, he will urge, that the sacred writers were but men—that, like others, they had their prejudices and infirmities—that though honest and competent, in the main, they made frequent mistakes—and consequently, that their statements cannot be received with implicit confidence.

I have endeavored, in these remarks, to point out the distinction between a believer and an infidel, as plainly and accurately as the nature of the case admits. Indeed, I have made the only distinction which seems to me possible. If any insist, that the proper distinction has not been made—that in order to make a man an infidel, he must openly and formally abjure Christianity, and pour contempt on the character of the Saviour; then, not one of the old English deists were infidels. Or if, to make a man an infidel, he must deny uniformly that God has made a revelation to man, that the Scriptures contain it, and, consequently, that these are, to some extent, inspired; then Hobbes was not an infidel, and neither was Morgan, Chubb, or Bolingbroke. Or if, to make a man an infidel, he must renounce the Christian name and profession, turn his back continually on the sacraments, and manifest no regard for Christianity, in any shape; then Woolston, Collins, Dodwell, and even Voltaire, will scarcely fall within the ranks of infidelity.

Besides, it follows from the nature of the case, that he who charges any portion of the canonical Scriptures with mistakes and errors, and sets it aside as no part of revelation, may, with scarcely less propriety or injury, set aside the whole. For if this man may reject one part, that may reject another; and who can decide, without a new revelation, what is to be rejected, and what retained? Here is a passage which contravenes my system of theology; which seems to me inexplicable and absurd; and I

reject it as no part of revelation. Another man rejects another passage for the same reason, and with the same right. A third does the same; and a fourth the same;—and what, in this way, is to become of the Bible?

The design of these remarks is to show, that all, who do not receive the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as a revelation from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of their faith, and the rule of their conduct;—all who set aside the Bible, in whole or in part, as not of divine origin;—all who charge the sacred writers with inconclusive reasonings, with inaccurate statements, with mistakes, errors, and contradictions, or with recording, in place of divine revelation, the mere suggestions of their own minds;—that all such are properly denominated infidels, notwithstanding they may claim the Christian name, or may come to the sacraments, (as did many of the English deists,) or may even stand in the place of teachers.

We are now prepared for the inquiry, whether, in view of the distinction which has been made, leading Unitarians, in Europe and America, do, or do not, fall fairly and properly within the ranks of infidelity? Do they, or do they not, exhibit those distinguishing traits, which go to constitute a man an infidel?—They profess, I know, to respect Christianity; and so did Lord Herbert and Blount. They profess to revere the character of Jesus; and so did Chubb and Morgan. They profess to be Christians, and come to the sacrament; and so did Hobbes and Toland. They would be thought, in some instances, the most consistent believers, and appear zealous in what they deem the cause of Christianity; and so did Woolston and Dodwell. They speak of the Bible as *containing* a revelation, and probably believe that some parts of it are inspired; and so did Lord Bolingbroke. “Genuine Christianity,” says he, “is *contained* in the Gospel. It is *the word of God*.”—The claims of Unitarians to be regarded as true Christians cannot, therefore, be settled, on any of these points. They may pretend and profess all these, and yet be infidels; for infidels have professed them all. The proper question is, How do standard Unitarian writers regard and treat the Bible? Do they receive the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as a revelation from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of their faith, and the rule of their conduct? Or do they set aside the Bible, in whole or in part, as being itself a revelation? Do they charge the sacred writers with inconclusive reasonings, with inaccurate statements, with mistakes, errors, and contradictions, or with recording, in place of divine revelation, the mere suggestions of their own minds? If it shall appear, on examination, that they do treat the Bible in this way, then they are, in effect, infidels. They may not speak out so plainly and decidedly as some of those infidel

writers whose names have been mentioned ; but they have adopted the same principles, are driving at the same result, and ought, in all reason, to be classed together. How, then, (to repeat the question,) do leading standard Unitarian writers, in Europe and America, regard and treat the Holy Scriptures?

One tells us, that "the prophets may have delivered *the offspring of their own brains* as divine revelations."**

Another says, that "the narrations," (in the New Testament,) "true or false, are only suited for *ignorant, uncultivated minds*, who cannot enter into the evidence of natural religion."†

A third speaks of St. John's portion of the New Testament, as written with "concise and abrupt obscurity, *inconsistent with itself*, and made up of allegories."‡

A fourth glories in having given "a little light to St. Paul's darkness ; a darkness, as some think, *industriously affected*."||

A fifth represents the history of the fall as *a fable* ; and though there is much truth in Moses' history, the dress is poetic. In Joshua, the circumstances of the conquest of Canaan are *fictitious*. The books of Samuel contain a *multitude of falsehoods*. There are no prophecies in the Psalms. Daniel is full of stories, *contrived or exaggerated by superstition*. With the other prophets, Christians have no concern."§

A sixth insists, that "the Godhead could not have required of Abraham so horrible a crime, [the offering of his son,] and there can be no justification, palliation, or excuse, for this pretended command of the Divinity."¶

A seventh explains the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost as an *electric gust*, and the effects which followed, as enthusiasm.**

An eighth suggests, that Peter *stabbed* Ananias, "which," says he, "does not at all disagree with the vehement and easily exasperated temper of Peter."††

A ninth teaches, "that the Pentateuch was composed about the time of the captivity ; that the Jewish ritual was of gradual formation, accessions being made to it by *superstition* ; and that the book of Chronicles (which is filled with scraps and *inconsistencies*) was foisted into the canon by some of the priesthood, who wished to exalt their own order."‡‡

Let us next hear some of the English Unitarians, on the same subject.

PRIESTLEY. "I have frequently declared myself *not* to be a believer in *the inspiration of the evangelists and apostles* as

* Semler. See Magee on Atonement and Sacrifice, p. 106.

† Steinbart ; *ibid.*

‡ Engedin ; *ibid.*

|| Gagneius ; *ibid.*

§ Extracted from Danem, in Erskine's Sketches of Church Hist., vol. i. p. 84.

¶ Eichhorn. See Stuart's Letters to Channing, p. 163.

** Thiess ; *ibid.* p. 165.

†† Heinrichs ; *ibid.*, p. 166.

‡‡ De Wette ; *ibid.* p. 167.

writers."—"The Scriptures were written *without any particular inspiration*, by men who wrote according to the best of their knowledge."—"Not that I consider the books of Scripture as *inspired*, and, on that account, entitled to this high degree of respect."—"That the books of Scripture were written by a particular *divine inspiration*, is a thing to which the writers themselves make *no pretensions*. It is a notion *destitute of all proof*, and that has done great injury to the evidence of Christianity,"---Dr. Priestley also charges the sacred writers with publishing "*lame accounts, improper quotations, and inconclusive reasonings*."*

BELSHAM. "The Scriptures contain a very faithful and credible *account* of the Christian doctrine, which is the true word of God; but *they are not themselves the word of God*, nor do they ever assume that title; and it is highly improper to speak of them as such, as it leads inattentive readers to suppose they are written under a *plenary inspiration, to which they make no pretensions*."†

EVANSON. "The evangelical histories contain *gross and irreconcilable contradictions*."‡

GILBERT WAKEFIELD. Mr. Wakefield tells us that his Essay on Inspiration was "intended, by a variety of arguments, to prove such a gift," [inspiration,] "as commonly understood, *not resident in the Gospel writers*." Again: "Some *qualifications and softening*s, in the case of *many* relations and occurrences in the Bible history, may be very properly applied," "upon the ground of *exaggeration, national vanity, and the pride of individuals*."||

IMPROVED VERSION. "The account of the miraculous conception of Jesus was probably the *fiction* of some early Gentile convert, who hoped, by elevating the dignity of the Founder, to abate the popular prejudice against the sect." p. 2.

MONTHLY REPOSITORY. "The historical books" [of Scripture] "are to be considered *merely as human testimony*, as depending for the *whole of their authority* on the high credibility which we justly ascribe to them, from the approved sanctity and veracity of the writers." "In favor of this opinion" are urged "the *contradictions* which not unfrequently occur."§

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.¶ "The evangelists were only the historians of an inspired person, and of a Divine revelation made by him; *they were not*, in their capacity of historians, *inspired themselves*." "The idea of *the evangelists being inspired writers* is quite inconsistent with what Luke says," chap. i. 3.---Mark's

* See Letters to Horsely. P. i. p. 132; Hist. of Early Opinions, vol. iv. p. 4; Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever, Part ii.; Letters to the Philosophers and Politicians of France, p. 38; Twelfth Letter to Mr. Burn.

† Review of Wilberforce, p. 19.

‡ Dissonance, p. 1.

|| Memoirs, vol. i. p. 233. vol. ii. p. 28.

§ For 1827, pp. 523, 524.

¶ A Unitarian periodical published in Scotland, and highly esteemed in this country. vol. i. p. 262.

"authority, as a writer, is *just equivalent to that of a short-hand writer or reporter, of modern times.*"---"*Inspiration has nothing to do with the composition of his*" (Matthew's) "*history.*"

The following quotations are from Le Clerc on Inspiration, a work published, a few years since, under the editorial inspection of Professor Norton of Harvard University. The learned Professor does not "vouch for the correctness of every opinion and expression," but adds, that "the general views are believed to be *correct.*" "It may be doubted," says he, "whether there is *anywhere to be found a more perspicuous and satisfactory statement on the subject in question,*" (inspiration,) "than what this tract presents." Let us, then, give attention, for a moment, to the very "*satisfactory*" views of Mr. Le Clerc.

"The apostles had no need of inspiration to tell what they had seen, and what they had heard Christ say." p. 63. "It is very plain that *the historians of Scripture were not inspired, by the CONTRADICTIONS that are found in the several circumstances of their histories.*" p. 66. "*Neither the words nor the things have been inspired into those who have given us the sacred history;* although, in the main, that history is very true, in the principal facts." p. 70. "There is no proof that what is contained in the Proverbs *was inspired* to Solomon." "There are very many of them that are but vulgar proverbs." p. 102. "There was *no inspiration* in this book," (Job,) "more than in the three foregoing." "It is likely there was such an one as Job, and that he met with great afflictions, which afforded subject to some Jew of the captivity to exercise his wit upon." pp. 108, 109. "There are other things which the apostles speak *of their own heads*, or which they draw by divers consequences from the Old Testament;" because, "having *no extraordinary inspiration for writing their epistles*, they insert in them divers things that concern their own designs, or their particular affairs." "An inspiration is attributed to the apostles to which *they never pretended*, and *whereof there is not the least mark left in their writings.*" pp. 121, 123.

So much for what Professor Norton thinks the "*satisfactory statement*" of Le Clerc, on the subject of inspiration. I shall now present some extracts directly from American writers.

DR. WARE. "We must distinguish between the *doctrines* delivered by the apostles and primitive teachers, and the *arguments, illustrations, and topics of persuasion*, which they employed to enforce them. The *former* we are to consider as given them by inspiration; the *latter* were THE SUGGESTIONS OF THEIR OWN MINDS, in the exercise of their respective talents, and the kinds and degrees of knowledge they possessed."*

* Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Lamson.

PROFESSOR NORTON. "The writings thus characterized" (as given by *inspiration of God*;) "may have been the works of prophets who received direct, miraculous communications from God; or they may have been *nothing more than the works of men, whose minds were acted upon by the motives which he presents, and who had that sense of religion and duty which his dispensations to the Jewish nation were adapted to produce*;" i. e. a part of the sacred writings (how great a part we are not told) is *nothing more than the work of good men, without any special divine assistance*. Professor Norton represents it as doubtful, whether even *so much as this* can be said for the Song of Solomon.*

In an article in "the General Repository," of which Professor Norton has avowed himself the author, he says, "Those are to be considered as liberal Christians, [Unitarians,] who believe that Christianity, in respect to *its main design*, is a revelation from God." He mentions it as one of the "characteristic *differences*" between Unitarians and the Orthodox, that "the *Orthodox* believe the writings of the evangelists and apostles to have been composed *under God's immediate and miraculous superintendence*;" and "that no allowance is to be made for *the inadvertence of the writer*, and none for *the exaggeration* produced by strong feelings."† Unitarians then, in the recorded judgement of Professor Norton, "believe the writings of the evangelists and apostles *NOT to have been composed under God's immediate and miraculous superintendence*," and that allowance is to be made for *the inadvertence of the writers*," and "for *the exaggeration produced by strong feelings*."

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER. A writer in this work, having represented the Bible "as *containing* a revelation from God," adds, "It is also to be regarded in another light, as *consisting wholly of HUMAN COMPOSITIONS*, like other writings of equal antiquity, the fair subjects of criticism," &c.‡

Another writer tells us, that "the sacred documents of our faith" were "prepared for *temporary use*," and are "filled with subjects of local interest, or *popular accommodation*." "The scheme of preparation which led the way to Christianity" (in the Old Testament) "is, for the most part, but dimly discerned, and *unsatisfactory even in what is plainly to be perceived*, mixed with the *doubtfulness of old traditions*, and with systems of *SUPERANNUATED ERRORS*." "They" (the Scriptures) "contain the treasures of a various wisdom, which are to be estimated according to their respective values; *according as they are in harmony with*

* Norton's Edition of Locke and Le Clerc, pp. 128, 129.

† Vol. i, pp. 1, 2.

‡ Vol. i. p. 6.

that supreme and original law of reason and the soul,* which is not so much a written, as an inbred law.”†

“There was a time, in the dark ages and afterwards, when it was maintained, we cannot say believed, for *the proposition does not admit of being believed*, that *the whole Bible*, including the historical books of the Old Testament, *was a revelation*.”‡

“The words of Christ were reported from memory by the evangelists, and *not always with perfect accuracy*. This is evident from the fact, that in recording the same discourse, or saying, the first three evangelists *differ from each other*, not unfrequently as to the words themselves, and occasionally also *as to their sense and bearing* ;” i. e. the evangelists occasionally *contradict one another*. “Now all the evangelists being themselves *allegorists*”—which term the writer defines to mean those who quote the scriptures in “*imaginary, secondary senses*,” which are “in their nature *arbitrary and fanciful*”—“ALL the evangelists being,” in this sense, “*allegorists*, it would not have been strange, if, unconsciously, and through *inadvertence*, they had given an *allegorical* turn to words, which were used by our Saviour only by way of *application*.” In plain English, the evangelists have probably *misrepresented* their Master !!

“The reasoning of St. Paul *will not always bear a philosophical scrutiny*.”§

“The canonical books of the new Testament *are not the revelation which God made by Christ*.” “They are nothing more than the best *records* which remain to us of the revelation.” “Neither the teaching of our Saviour, nor the influence of God’s Spirit in enlightening the minds of the Apostles, preserved them from all the *errors* of their age, from the influence of all human *prejudices* and feelings, from all *inconclusive reasoning*, or from all *ambiguity, impropriety, and insufficiency* in the use of language.”||

CHRISTIAN REGISTER. “The parenthesis, ‘*I speak as a man*,’ is very often to be understood in the sacred writings, especially in those parts which *do not profess to be a revelation*.”¶

MR. DABNEY. “The opinion that Paul and the Apostles generally cherished the belief” that the second coming of Christ was near at hand “does not at all affect their inspiration, which secured them from error *only* on what belonged to the system of Christian doctrine.”**

At the close of this array of quotations, which might be enlarged almost indefinitely, I feel as though little need be said. I have previously pointed out the distinction between a believer and an in-

* Reason, then, is the standard by which the Scriptures are to be tried; and not the Scriptures the standard by which our reasonings are to be tried. So said Robinson, an English Unitarian: “*The sufficiency of reason is the soul of our system*.” History of Baptism, p. 47. And so say all the Deists.

† Vol. iii. pp. 19, 106.

‡ Vol. iv. p. 347.

§ Vol. v. pp. 59, 69.

|| New Series, vol. i. pp. 344, 345.

¶ November, 4, 1826.

** Annotations, p. 322.

fidel, and the *only* distinction which, as it *seems* to me, the nature of the case admits. The true believer receives the canonical Scriptures as a revelation from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of his faith, and the rule of his conduct. Produce any passage, satisfy him that it belongs to the canon, and is properly interpreted and applied, and he bows to it and receives it. The infidel, on the contrary, rejects the canonical Scriptures, in whole or in part, as being themselves a revelation, and does not hesitate to charge the sacred writers with inconclusive reasoning, with inaccurate statements, with mistakes, errors and contradictions, or with recording, in place of divine revelation, the mere suggestions of their own minds.

Such is the proper distinction between a believer and an infidel; and in view of it, who can hesitate where to class those leading, standard Unitarians, whose writings have been quoted? For we hear them denying, almost with one mouth, the inspiration of the sacred writings. We hear them asserting, that “the canonical books are not a revelation”—“are not the word of God.” We hear them speaking of these holy books, or portions of them, as “human compositions,” as “unsatisfactory,” as “mixed with the doubtfulness of old traditions, and with systems of superannuated errors.” We hear them charging the writers of these books with “superstition,” “prejudice,” “inadvertence,” “exaggeration,” fiction, inaccuracy, with “the errors of their age,” with “inconclusive reasoning,” with “ambiguity, impropriety, and insufficiency in the use of language,” with being inconsistent with themselves, and with one another, with “irreconcilable contradictions,” with making “improper quotations,” with “speaking of their own heads,” with publishing “lame accounts,” “the suggestions of their own minds,” “the offspring of their own brains!!” But I am shocked, as I am sure my readers must be, at bringing these representations together, and exhibiting them in a single view. And yet I have not presented the strongest expressions which might be fairly gathered from the quotations which have been made. Is it an abuse of language to call such writers infidels? Is it an offence against the rules of propriety, to charge them with holding and teaching principles which amount to infidelity?

Formerly, it has been complained of, if American Unitarians have been ranked in the same class with those of Europe. But this complaint cannot, with any show of reason, be longer urged. The conductors of the *Christian Examiner*, it will be seen, go all lengths with the English Unitarians, and if, as yet, they fall behind the Germans in extravagance, it is not because their principles are materially dissimilar.

I only add in conclusion, and I do it with sorrow and alarm, that the infidelity of leading Unitarians in this region is not, with them, mere philosophical speculation. It has been poured out upon this

community, in conversation, in the lecture room, from the pulpit, and the press, till the whole moral atmosphere is in a degree infected. In almost all circles, the man of God is liable more or less to encounter it. Wherever the evangelical preacher brings forward the plain doctrines of the Gospel, and enforces them by an appeal to the Scriptures, he is exposed to meet—not only those who will whisper in secret, ‘You mistake the meaning of the Bible; you do not interpret the passage correctly’—but those who will say, in bolder accents, ‘To be sure, the sacred writers teach thus and so, but they were not unfrequently mistaken; they were sometimes in error; and sometimes they do not mean what they seem to say,—as they intentionally accommodate themselves to the superstitions around them.’ Now this is practical infidelity, destroying, in multitudes of minds, all the force of evidence derived from the Scriptures. And I am grieved to say that I think it prevalent infidelity. It has rolled over this portion of our fair land like a destroying deluge, and unless the Lord lift up a standard against it, where shall its proud waves be stayed? It certainly is high time that things were called by their right names, and that the public were loudly and solemnly warned of the dangers, that surround them.

To the Editor of the Christian Examiner and Theological Review.

SIR,

Patience has doubtless been mutually tried by delay: mine, in waiting upon the reviewer till I could wait no longer, and assumed engagements which until now could not be fulfilled; and his, in waiting for my reply, until hope deferred may have made his heart sick, and the gratification of it now operate as a disappointment. It is probable that all the facts and arguments in the case are before the public, and that, the smoke of the conflict having passed away, nothing remains, but to traverse the field of battle, and ascertain the result.

Whatever the effect may be upon ourselves, the Public, I have no doubt, will reap advantage from the controversy. The truth will be ascertained and admitted; and in respect to those who have any character to lose, rumor and falsehood will be stopped.

The note which led to the controversy was occasioned by the consideration, that Unitarians of distinction charged the living Calvinistic party, with holding the doctrine that infants are damned, and that the Unitarian community generally, were led to believe the charge true. Knowing it to be untrue, and in its effect slanderous,

I denied it, and exhorted all who had circulated such reports, that they commit to memory without delay, the ninth commandment, which is, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'

The note, which once more must go into type, is as follows :—

"I am aware that Calvinists are represented as believing and teaching the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones. But having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of the most distinguished Calvinistic divines in New England, and in the middle and southern and western states, I must say that I have never seen or heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man, minister or layman, who believed or taught it. And I feel authorised to say, that Calvinists as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them. And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons who have been accustomed to propagate this slander, that they commit to memory without delay, the ninth commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

This note contains the following particulars :—

1. A recognition of the fact that Calvinists are represented as believing and teaching, that infants are damned.

2. Reasons for believing the charge to be slanderous, viz. that "I have been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of the most approved Calvinistic divines in New England, and in the southern and western states, and I have never seen or heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man, minister or layman, who believed or taught it."

3. The inference from these premises,—that Calvinists, as a body, do no more teach the doctrine of infant damnation than those who slander them.

4. The recommendation, that all who charge Calvinists with holding the doctrine, commit to memory the ninth commandment, which is, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'

In the note, no denomination or person in particular, is charged with having borne false witness, but it is asserted merely, that it has been done by somebody, and that whoever has done it, has been guilty of false witness against the great body of Calvinists.

The reviewer acknowledges himself to be implicated in the charge of bearing false witness against his neighbor, the serious charge of falsehood and slander, and in duty bound to come out in self-defence.

The defence consisted in quotations from Calvinistic authors ancient and modern, to prove,

1. That the doctrine is a vital and inseparable part of the Calvinistic system.

2. That approved Calvinistic writers, such as I ought to have seen, teach it.

Now as my note certainly does charge somebody with slandering living Calvinists, and as the reviewer admits himself implicated in the charge contained in the note, without any qualification, limi-

tation or exception, I really understood him to admit, that he had charged the living Calvinistic party, with holding the doctrine, and that his reference to the system, and to writers, was intended as proof of the sentiments of the living party on that point. Whether it was my fault or the reviewer's, that I so understood him, may appear in the sequel. But thus, most assuredly, I did understand him; and, of course, knowing the charge to be false, and perceiving the proof to be irrelevant and vain, I did indeed, in my reply, speak in a tone of rebuke which no slight violation of religious rights and moral rectitude would demand.

In the course of my reply I attempted to show,

1. That the Calvinistic system does not teach nor imply that infants are damned.

2. That it has never been a doctrine received by the churches, denominated Calvinistic.

3. That the quotations from most approved writers, do not contain the doctrine. And,

4. That if they did contain it, this would be no evidence of the opinions on that point of the existing Calvinistic party: Because no author represents, in all respects, the party to which he belongs; and because, as the reviewer well knew, the Calvinists of New England, and extensively through the nation, do not hold to those views of imputation, from which he attempted to infer the doctrine.

In his reply to my letters, the reviewer charges me with wilfully evading and changing the point in debate, which was not, as *he* insists, Do the living Calvinistic party hold to the doctrine of infant damnation? but, "Has the doctrine that infants are damned, been held by approved Calvinistic writers? Is it a part of the Calvinistic system?" *Christian Examiner*, Vol. v. No. iii. p. 231.

Now if this be so; if the reviewer, and others in whose defence he came out, had not, before the writing of the note, charged the living Calvinistic party with holding the doctrine; if my note contains no charge against any for slandering the living, and only for slandering the Calvinistic system, and most approved writers; and if the reviewer had no intention to convict living Calvinists, by showing that the system contains, and approved writers teach, the doctrine of infant damnation, and meant only to repel the charge of slandering his neighbor, the Calvinistic system, and the most approved Calvinistic writers; then, however strange it may seem that he should understand me to call the Calvinistic system his neighbor, and ancient Calvinistic writers his neighbors; yet, if it be so, I must admit that I have been disquieted in vain, and that the shot, which have swept over the ground which I supposed the reviewer to occupy, have only given demonstration of what destruction he had met with, had he been there, and

what a mercy it is that he was not there.—If, also, I have knowingly attempted “to evade the question at issue, by a frequent and fretful shifting of positions,” and attempted “to change the whole bearing of the controversy ;” then, no terms of reproach, which self-respect might permit the reviewer to use, would be undeserved by me. For, Sir, I hold it to be wrong to contend for victory against the truth ; and as dishonorable as it is immoral : and it is my desire that this sentiment may predominate on both sides of the controversy.

The points of dispute between myself and the reviewer are now manifest.

My claim is, that my note, since he has taken the charge it contains to himself, does charge *him* with having slandered the living Calvinistic party, in representing that they hold the doctrine of infant damnation ; and that, in his reply to that note, he did design and attempt to prove this charge against the living party to be true, by his attempts to prove it to be a doctrine of the system and of approved writers.

The claim of the reviewer is, that he did not mean to admit, that he had accused the living party of holding that infants are damned, and did not attempt to prove that they do hold it : That he understood me in my note to charge him with slandering the Calvinistic system, and most approved Calvinistic writers, and attempted to defend himself against this charge only.

The following considerations convince me, that I understood the point in debate correctly, and that the reviewer did set out to vindicate himself from the charge of slandering living Calvinists, by proving from their system and writers, that they hold the doctrine.

1. I had no temptation when my note was written, to charge any one, with bearing false witness against the Calvinistic system, or Calvinistic writers. With the accusation in that form, I did not feel myself particularly concerned.

2. I had just occasion to charge somebody with bearing false witness against living Calvinists ; because to my certain knowledge, they were slandered as holding to the damnation of infants, and the slander was extensively believed, and was producing, as might have been expected, great prejudice and aversion.

3. It was my deliberate intention, in that note, to charge living men, with slandering living men.

4. The language of the note contains such a charge.

The phrases ‘ Calvinists are accused, and Calvinists are as far from teaching as those who accuse them,’ include living Calvinists primarily, and unless there be something to exclude the living, and to extend the words to Calvinists of past ages, they refer to the living exclusively, and only.

5. There is nothing in the note, to turn the charge of false wit-

ness from living Calvinists, to the Calvinistic system, or to Calvinistic writers. The Calvinistic system is not named nor alluded to in the note, nor is there in it any charge, that Calvinistic writers have been slandered. The charge is that "Calvinists are represented," and that "Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching" &c. The allusion to writers is not in the form of a charge, but is in the form of evidence, that Calvinists, and Calvinists as a body, have been falsely accused. There is no charge in the note, of slandering the Calvinistic system, or Calvinistic writers. If this then was, in the opinion of the reviewer, the point in debate, it is a point of his own setting up, not mine.

6. No authorized use of terms can justify the reviewer in understanding me to mean the Calvinistic system, and Calvinistic writers, as the neighbors whom I accuse him of slandering. In what possible sense is the Calvinistic system his neighbor? And where is the "*usus loquendi*," which would lead the reviewer to call Calvinistic writers his neighbors? It would be a stretch of imagination, to call persons of far distant ages our neighbors; and next to a miracle, I should think, that the terms of my note should exclude living Calvinists from the mind of the reviewer, as those whom he is charged with slandering, and thrust in, the Calvinistic system and Calvinistic writers.

7. These difficulties are increased, when we consider that the reviewer certainly did understand my note as charging him with slandering the living Calvinistic party. His own words are, "If Dr. B. had merely told us that he did not believe it," (the doctrine of infant damnation,) &c. "But to deny it in the name of a party whose accredited organ he would fain be considered, &c. Ah! the reviewer then understood me to deny that the Calvinistic party, whom I affect to represent, hold to the doctrine of infant damnation; and, of course, he did understand me to charge him with bearing false witness against living Calvinistic men; for he says, that I venture to "speak in behalf of the whole Calvinistic party of past and present times;" of course, then, he understood me to charge him with slandering the whole Calvinistic party of the present as well as past times. And once more, he says, I was 'equally explicit in my disclaimer both in respect to the living and the dead.' He understood me, therefore, to charge him as explicitly with slandering the living as the dead.

The facts in the case, then, by the reviewer's own showing, are as follows:

1. He understood me to charge him with slandering the whole Calvinistic party of present times, as well as the system and writers.

2. He felt in duty bound to deny, and defend himself against

one part of the charge, that which respected the system and approved writers, but has not denied, nor attempted to defend himself against the charge of falsehood and slander, in respect to the whole Calvinistic party of present times, and has even given his reasons for not doing it: 'Because it would decoy him on to a more unpromising part of the field;' because the question respecting the opinions of living Calvinists is a "more doubtful one;" because he was not "bound to go from house to house and catechise the Orthodox of Boston and vicinity touching their soundness in the faith of their master;" because, in the present controversy, "we have not yet undertaken, nor do we feel it to be our duty, to prove what we knew from the beginning it was impracticable to ascertain," a point which we never touched, "a question which we left untouched, as we found it."

We honor his prudence,—but we cannot but think his knowing himself unable to prove it should have been a reason for not making the charge.

But why did the reviewer leave the question untouched? Was he not as really charged with slandering the living as the dead? Is it not as criminal to slander the whole Calvinistic party of the present age, as to slander the Calvinistic system and Calvinistic writers? If the reviewer had never made such a charge against the whole Calvinistic party of the present age, did he not owe it as much to himself to say so, as to defend himself against what he considered a false imputation of slandering the system and writers? If he had made this charge against the whole present party, was he not as much in duty bound to prove it, if he could, as in the other case? and by every principle of honor and religion bound to retract the charge, if he could not prove it? Why, then, has the reviewer passed over in silence the charge of slandering the whole Calvinistic party of the present age? a charge which, it seems, he understood and passed over by design.

3. The question presses the harder, if we consider that the *Christian Disciple*, several years before my note was written, did publicly and expressly charge the whole Calvinistic party of the present age with holding the doctrine of infant damnation. The words are, that infant damnation "is a doctrine which follows necessarily from the Calvinistic system, and which would now be insisted on by all real and consistent Calvinists, if they thought their people would bear it;" and that this charge is extracted and repeated in the review of my note, without retraction, and in a way which implies a repetition of the charge.

The facts in the case then stand thus:

The *Christian Disciple* had publicly charged all real consistent Calvinists with holding the doctrine of infant damnation.

In my note, I deny the truth of such a charge and call it a slander.

The reviewer understood my denial to respect the whole Calvinistic party of present times, and my charge of false witness to respect all who accused them of holding to infant damnation; admits that he is implicated in the charge of falsehood and slander, and bound to defend himself, and comes out for that purpose. By quoting the charge from the *Christian Disciple*, he repeats it, and there leaves it as he found it; says not a word to prove it true; comes and looks upon it, like Levite upon Jew, and passes by on the other side. But in the mean time, he gathers up all his resources, and puts forth all his energies, to repel the charge of slandering his neighbor "the Calvinistic System," whom no one ever suspected of being his neighbor, or had charged him with slandering; and feels indignant at being charged with bearing false witness against his neighbors, the Calvinistic writers, and compasses sea and land for evidence to clear himself. But under the charge of bearing false witness against "living Calvinistic men," the whole Calvinistic party of the present times, in the sight of the nation, he meekly lies down—lies down deliberately under the acknowledged charge of falsehood and slander—lays his hand on his mouth, and his mouth in the dust, and pleads guilty—and says he knew from the beginning that the charge against the living Calvinistic party could not be proved. With this we ought to be satisfied, had it pleased the reviewer to stop here. But, *mirabile dictu*, in a moment he is on his feet, and boldly declares that the opinion of Calvinists of the present age was not the question at issue, and charges me with palpable attempts to evade the question at issue by a frequent and fretful shifting of positions.

Having now ascertained the question at issue in this controversy, I proceed to consider some of the results. And,

1. It is a point settled by this controversy, that the Calvinists of Boston, of New England, and of the United States, do not hold to the doctrine that infants are damned.

This accusation has been publicly made, and publicly denied. Time enough has been offered for research, correspondence, and personal inquiry—and no evidence has been produced. This might suffice, as all men are to be presumed innocent of odious accusations, until such accusations are proved to be true. In the present case, the force of this equitable principle is greatly augmented, by the urgent motives which pressed the reviewer to defend himself and his friends, who were charged, as he admits, with falsehood and slander in respect to the whole Calvinistic party of present times. Silence, therefore, in such circumstances, may justly be regarded a decisive proof that the whole party, as such, are clear in this matter. But the conclusion, so just and forcible in itself, the reviewer establishes by the concession that he had not proved the charge,—had not attempted to prove it, and knew from the beginning, even when he made it, that he could not prove it.

2. It follows, therefore, secondly, as the result of this discussion, that all of every name who have charged the Calvinists of the United States with holding the doctrine of infant damnation have been guilty of bearing false witness against their neighbors. The Christian Disciple and the reviewer stand at the head of those who have done this; and all who before or after them have made the charge are involved in the same condemnation. Once more, therefore, I feel authorised to repeat, that Calvinists as a body are as far from holding the doctrine that infants are damned as those who falsely accuse them, and I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons who have been accustomed to propagate the slander, that they commit to memory without delay the ninth commandment, which is, THOU SHALL NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOR.

The great and only end, for which I entered upon this controversy, viz. "To compel those who have been accustomed to circulate the reports in question, to cease from their slanders, or to assume in some tangible form the responsibility of uttering them," has now been accomplished. They have adopted the latter alternative—have assumed the responsibility of uttering reports in their nature slanderous, and which they admit they cannot prove.
(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS.

A REPLY TO A LETTER IN THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, ADDRESSED TO THE REV. PARSONS COOKE. Boston: Peirce and Williams, 1829. pp. 38. Also, THE MORE RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF MR. COOKE, in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, and *Boston Courier*.

WE do not purpose, in this number, to enter into an examination of all the matters touched upon by the Rev. Mr. Cooke and his opponents in their several publications. On another occasion, we may resume the subject. At present, we wish to confine our remarks to one topic of great practical importance, *we refer to the management of the pecuniary concerns of Harvard University during the presidency of Dr. Kirkland.*

This subject was first incidentally introduced by Mr. Cooke, in a note, subjoined to his Reply to a Letter which had been addressed to him, and published in the Christian Examiner. This note drew forth the following communication from the Hon. John Davis, which appeared in the Boston Daily Advertiser, April 4, 1829.

MR. HALE.—In a pamphlet lately published in this city, entitled, "*A Reply to a Letter, in the Christian Examiner, addressed to the Rev. Parsons Cooke,*" there is the following note, in connexion with many severe, and, as I believe, unfounded strictures, in reference to Harvard College :

"I am constrained here to speak on a subject, in relation to which I would gladly be silent. I have been credibly and repeatedly informed, that the accounts of the late Treasurer and President of Harvard College have never been properly adjusted, and *cannot be*. A large sum is said to be missing, and not to be found. Certainly this matter ought to be attended to. *The people have a right to know what has become of this money.* And we here see the necessity of having other men, besides a collection of Unitarians, in the Board of Overseers."

The Rev. Parsons Cooke, of Ware, is the acknowledged author of that pamphlet. The official documents annexed to this notice, will, it is presumed, be considered by the public a sufficient reply to his slanderous paragraph, respecting the late Treasurer of Harvard College.

In regard to the accounts of my esteemed friend, the late President of that institution, who is now absent, a communication, in his behalf, from Mr. Lowell, is readily subjoined to my defence.

JOHN DAVIS.

Boston, November 10, 1829.

The subscriber having been employed by a Committee of the Corporation of Harvard College, to investigate the accounts of the Hon. John Davis, late Treasurer of the College, has attended to that service. He has examined all the accounts and vouchers, as well those of the Treasurer, as of Stephen Higginson, Jun. Esq., Steward, from the time of their respective appointments in 1810, and 1818, to the time of the resignation of the former, on 1st February last. Satisfactory evidence has been furnished of the payment of the several sums charged by them, all the mistakes which have been discovered in the accounts are corrected, and the books regularly closed.

(Signed)

BENJA. R. NICHOLS.

Boston, November 10, 1827.

Boston, November 13, 1827.

Having this day received, from the Committee of the Corporation of Harvard College, the book and accounts settled, as per my receipt given them, by said accounts it appears that the sum of \$6859 79 cents remains due in cash from the Hon. John Davis, late Treasurer; this may certify, that I have received said balance, as follows, viz.: on the 12th day of February last the sum of \$5880 72, and on the 10th day of the present month \$978 87, making the said sum of \$6859 79. Also, the sum of \$45 50 cents for interest due.—All which have been regularly entered in the College Books.

EBEN'R FRANCIS,

Treasurer Harvard College.

To the Honorable and Reverend Board of Overseers of Harvard College.

The Committee of this Board, appointed 10th June, 1826, to examine the Treasurer's accounts, ask leave to report :

That, since their appointment, the Hon. Judge Davis, the late Treasurer, having resigned his office, a Committee was chosen, by the Corporation, to cause his books and accounts, during the whole term of his continuance in office, a period of seventeen years, to be fully examined; a measure adopted by the entire concurrence of the late Treasurer himself. That Committee were authorized to employ an Auditor for this purpose, and accordingly appointed Benjamin R. Nichols, Esq., by whom all the books, accounts and vouchers, during that period, have been very laboriously and minutely examined, and all errors corrected, and the same are now certified to be correct; and all the books, securities and other property of the College, including a balance in cash of \$6859 79 cents, have been delivered, by the late Treasurer, to the Committee of the Corporation, and, by them, to his successor, Ebenezer Francis, Esq., and receipts given for the same accordingly, by the Committee, and the present Treasurer.—Your Committee, therefore, have not thought it necessary to examine the same accounts again, being entirely satisfied with the accounts, adjustment and receipts which have been submitted to them.

The details of these proceedings were laid before the Committee, and can at any time be examined by the Overseers, if they see fit.

THOMAS L. WINTHROP,
JOHN WELLES,
WILLIAM SPOONER.

Boston, 10th January, 1828.

At the semi-annual meeting of the Overseers of Harvard University, 10th January, 1828,

Voted, That the foregoing report be accepted.

A true copy. Attest,

JOHN PIERCE, Sec'y.

[The Committee of the Corporation referred to in the foregoing documents, were Hon. Nathaniel Bowditch and Hon. Francis C. Gray.]

Boston, April 2d. 1829.

Hon. JOHN DAVIS,

DEAR SIR—Understanding that it is your intention to expose the falsehood of an atrocious libel, contained in a pamphlet lately published by the Rev. Parsons Cooke, reflecting on your character, and on that of the Rev. Dr. Kirkland, as having embezzled monies belonging to the College, I feel myself bound, in the absence of Dr. Kirkland, as his friend, and under express authority from him, to declare, that Dr. Kirkland's accounts with the Corporation of Harvard College were completely adjusted immediately after his resignation—that he was fully discharged, and a liberal grant made to him in consideration of the eminent services which he had rendered to that seminary. I will add, that of all the libels which political and theological hatred have fabricated, this one of the Rev. Parsons Cooke's is, under all its circumstances, the most malicious and unprincipled.

JOHN LOWELL.

It thus appears that a Committee of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College was appointed, on the 10th of June, 1826, to examine the Treasurer's accounts; and that, for reasons not disclosed to the public, and before such examination was entered into by this committee, the Hon. Judge Davis, the Treasurer, resigned his office. It further appears that, on his resignation, a committee, consisting of Hon. Nathaniel Bowditch, and Hon. Francis C. Gray, was chosen by the Corporation, to cause his books and accounts, during the whole term of his continuance in office, a period of seventeen years, to be fully examined; that this committee was authorized to appoint an Auditor; and accordingly that they appointed Benjamin R. Nichols, Esq., who, on the 10th of November, 1827, gave the certificate above quoted. It does not appear at what precise time Mr. Nichols was appointed to this business; but, as Judge Davis resigned, 1st February, 1827, it is to be presumed that it was at or about that time.—Before we proceed to examine the auditor's certificate, it may be stated that it has been publicly reported, and we presume has never been denied, that Mr. Nichols received three thousand dollars for his services herein rendered, and that this sum came, either directly or indirectly, from the late Treasurer.

With reference to Mr. Nichols, we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we have never heard the slightest imputation cast upon his integrity or capacity. He doubtless disposed of an

embarrassing case with as much adroitness as could have been reasonably anticipated. His own character, as an accurate and honest accountant, was involved, but must not be sacrificed ; and we regard his certificate as an admirable instance of agile extrication.

Relative to this matter, it deserves notice, that *Mr. Nichols was employed at all*. Had the accounts of the Treasurer, during his term of office, been correctly kept, accurately cast, properly vouched, and suitably audited from year to year, two gentlemen of such intelligent and practised skill as Mr. Bowditch and Mr. Gray could have examined the whole books and papers necessary to be submitted for inspection in, at most, seventeen hours, and perhaps in seventeen minutes. The mind of the former gentleman could instantly have grasped all the intricacies of a book of Dr. and Cr., if it had been kept in some tolerable order, without calling in the aid of any other accountant. The commentator of La Place would, by the thread of his own perspicacious intellect alone, have wound his way through any mathematical tortuosities but those of an Egyptian labyrinth. But we doubt not he would rather have weighed the sixth satellite of Herschel, than have attempted to adjust and rectify the uncertain and disjointed materials, out of which Mr. Nichols sedulously strove to educe some order.

Again ; it is noticeable that this Committee of the Corporation authorized Mr. Nichols to cause the books and accounts of the Treasurer, *during the whole term of his continuance in office*, to be fully examined. This does not appear to have been done at the request, though doubtless with the concurrence of the Treasurer. But is this the mode in which the treasurers of other institutions are treated, on resigning their offices ? Are accounts of long standing, which are correctly kept, vouched, and audited, thus brought up anew and re-examined ? If the accounts of Harvard College were not thus kept by the late Treasurer, nor thus audited by those whose duty it was, then is there an explanation of this otherwise unaccountable mode of procedure. How is this matter ? Did not Mr. Nichols fairly earn his money for "his laborious and minute examination," embracing a period of seventeen years, and extending through nine months ? Were not he and his friends for a long time in doubt whether the College was solvent or bankrupt ? And was not his joy unequalled, save by that of Columbus, when, at length, he saw the land ?

Once more ; it deserves to be noticed, that this certificate was given and received, *without the intent of its being made public*. It was evidently drawn up in as favorable terms for the late Treasurer, as the nature of the case would admit. We do not hear that he complained of it, and we presume that he had no reason to complain. Let us, then, examine this curious docu-

ment. And we ask, Is it in the terms usually employed in such certificates? Does it bear witness to the accurate and business-like manner in which the pecuniary affairs of the College had been conducted? Does it testify to full entries, regular transfers, authorized orders, and faithful vouchers, for all sums paid out? As it extends through a period of seventeen years, does it certify that the Treasurer's books and accounts had been annually and regularly examined and audited? No; none of this. Mr. Nichols tells us that he examined "all the accounts and vouchers of the Treasurer and Steward;" i. e. *he examined all the accounts and vouchers they had to produce.* Well, how do these tally? On this point Mr. Nichols says nothing. All may, or may not, have been square and regular. In the circumstances of the case, such a certificate, of itself, excites strong suspicions that there was something wrong. Mr. Nichols does not tell us that the Treasurer and Steward have regular accounts of all their receipts and expenditures; nor does he say that they have sufficient vouchers for the sums they profess to have paid out; nor does he so much as hint that the various expenditures and appropriations made by these gentlemen were in pursuance of votes of the Corporation. All this ground his certificate leaves untouched. The amount of information afforded by Mr. Nichols is, that "satisfactory evidence has been furnished of the payment of the several sums charged by them, all the mistakes which have been discovered in the accounts are corrected, and the books regularly closed." After nine months "laborious and minute examination," the strongest certificate Mr. Nichols can honestly give informs us only that evidence had been produced sufficient to *satisfy him* of the payment of the several sums charged by the Treasurer and Steward. How many sums were received and not acknowledged? How many paid out, and not charged? How many and how large unauthorized orders of the late President were paid? How large a sum was paid by the Steward, without the concurrence of the Corporation, after the Corporation had expressly forbidden the President to draw on the Treasurer, and when the Steward must have known the fact? Upon these points Mr. Nichols, with feelings very natural to a gentleman in his circumstances, observes a discreet silence. He must say something, and so he tells us that "satisfactory evidence" has been produced that the late Treasurer and Steward actually paid the sums charged by them. "Satisfactory evidence!" What was this evidence? Was it regular vouchers? Most certainly not; for, had it been, Mr. Nichols understands his business too well to have given the lame and impotent certificate before quoted. Had such been the evidence, the late Treasurer, too, understands his rights too well to have accepted, still less to have been satisfied with, that certificate.

But suppose this evidence did satisfy the mind of Mr. Nichols; was it such as the people of Massachusetts have a right to demand of those to whom are entrusted the immense funds bestowed by the Commonwealth upon the oldest and most cherished institution of the land? If this evidence, which was deemed satisfactory by Mr. Nichols, was not the ordinary and appropriate evidence of vouchers, then let it be produced, that *the people, whose money has been expended*, may judge whether the evidence is also satisfactory to them. Let there be no blinking, no shrinking, no keeping back. Let all be above-board and open to the face of day and the light of truth.

Mr. Nichols tells us, moreover, that "all the mistakes which have been discovered in the accounts are corrected." What were these mistakes? how large? how often occurring? what was their amount? one thousand dollars, or five, or forty? But, many or few, great or small, they "are corrected." How were they corrected? Were vouchers subsequently produced? Or did the auditor take the word of the gentlemen, in place of vouchers? Or was the result guessed at, and jumped at, according to the best light that could be obtained? But, finally, "the books are *regularly closed*." "What does this mean? that the books had been fairly and accurately kept? or only that, whether accurate or not, a result has at length been formed, and the work of examination finished? And who closed the books? the Treasurer, or the Auditor? It was the duty of the Treasurer to have all his accounts correctly cast, and well vouched, and his books regularly closed, before they went into the Auditor's hands. But here, it would seem that the Auditor, having corrected all the mistakes which he discovered, was left to close the books himself." There is something wrong, something hollow, something rotten in this matter. The certificate of Mr. Nichols, on which the late Treasurer relies for his defence, is an unusual, a suspicious document. We ask all intelligent men of business to examine it closely, and then decide on its character and its intent. It was too evidently designed to patch up and plaster over a bad concern.

Soon after the "Communication" above quoted from Hon. John Davis appeared in the Daily Advertiser, Mr. Cooke addressed a pertinent and forcible letter to the Editor, which called forth a reply from the Hon. John Lowell, in his usual style. We would not trespass on the patience of our readers by any extract from this reply, or any remarks upon it, but that Mr. Lowell undesignedly tells more truth than he intended. The following quotation deserves attention.

"Mr. Cooke charges me with having volunteered my services in defence of Dr. Kirkland, and this too, in face of my explicit declaration, that I had been expressly authorised so to do. If it had been true, all ingenuous minds would

have commended me for the act. President Kirkland had been my cherished friend from our earliest youth. I had been his associate in the Corporation of Harvard College for thirteen years. He was absent, and an invalid. I had a right, and these circumstances imposed it upon me as a sacred duty, to defend my venerated and absent friend. But I had his written and *oral* request to perform this duty, and since my publication, I have received his express approbation of my conduct."

On the publication of Mr. Cooke's pamphlet, and of Mr. Lowell's letters, Dr. Kirkland was absent, if we mistake not, in a distant part of the Union, in Kentucky or Louisiana. Yet Mr. Lowell informs us that he already, before any charge is urged against his "venerated and absent friend," had his "written and *oral* request" to defend him. Indeed! President Kirkland, then, before leaving Boston, must have anticipated such a charge as that Mr. Cooke has brought forward. Why? Let Mr. Lowell and those who would shield President Kirkland answer,—*WHY?* Innocence is not suspicious. Guilt may anticipate attack, and imagine a defence. Mr. Lowell, in the ardor of self-justification, has, to every reflecting mind, certified all that Mr. Cooke had insinuated or asserted. It is plain from Mr. Lowell's statement, and from President Kirkland's "written and *oral* request," that rumors were abroad in the circle of their acquaintance, and among the friends of the College, unfavorable to Dr. Kirkland. Were not these rumors the same that had reached Mr. Cooke? We have a respectable opinion of President Kirkland's talents, but still we do not believe him a prophet. We suspect he had some data, besides the gift of vaticination, from which to anticipate a charge like that of Mr. Cooke, and to authorise his friend, by "written and *oral* request," to defend him. A defence, however, from Mr. Bowditch and Mr. Gray, who understand the facts of the case, and have some self-possession, would be quite as satisfactory to the public as any letter from the Hon. John Lowell. Will those gentlemen pen such a defence? Till they, or other gentlemen equally intelligent, honest, and honorable, who can speak from personal knowledge of the facts, shall offer such defence, we shall assume that there was ground for the reports which were in circulation before, and were published by Mr. Cooke after, the departure of Dr. Kirkland.

Mr. Lowell may insinuate what he will about the health of his "cherished friend;" *he* knows, and all behind the curtain know, that it was not the failure of health alone, which caused the resignation of Dr. Kirkland. There was dissatisfaction, deep and irremediable, on the part of some members of the Corporation, who were too clear headed to be bamboozled, and too upright to countenance what they could not but deem perversions, or gross misappropriations, of the funds and charities entrusted to their supervision and control.

Mr. Lowell may endeavor to enlist theological prejudices in behalf of his friend, but he much misjudges both his cause and this community, if he expects to shield any public agent, however high, and however respected, from responsibility, by any such device. Before the *ardent* imagination of Mr. Lowell "the scenes of queen Mary" are revived, while faggots, flames and blood are seen "dancing in all the mazes of metaphorical confusion." He tells us, "there is no longer, to be sure, the *corporal* suffering, but the more *refined* cruelty of mental torture." But whence all this outcry about queen Mary, and the inquisition, and faggots, and flames? It results from the simple inquiry, whether the late President of Harvard College was duly and properly authorised to draw on the late Treasurer and Steward of that College for the several sums by them advanced to his orders; and whether he and they have proper and sufficient vouchers for the several sums which passed through their hands? Does it indicate a truculent disposition, to require that public agents, through whose hands public monies to a very great amount are annually passing, should be responsible to that public, in the ordinary way, for the sums received and disbursed? Let honesty decide the question. In the apprehension of Mr. Lowell, the sensibilities of the late President and Treasurer of Harvard College, are so exquisite as to endure "*the refined* cruelty of mental torture," at the bare imagination that they are to be called upon to produce the ordinary credible vouchers for the several sums of public money they have received and expended. How far they will engage the sympathies of a New England community is scarcely problematical. Mr. Lowell's attempt to throw the shield of theological prejudice between his "cherished friend" and public scrutiny will never do. Though the President of Harvard University be a Doctor of Divinity or a Doctor of Laws, he is not above nor beyond the reach of those laws which govern other men. Eminence of station communicates no exemption from responsibility.

We have seen by Mr. Lowell's letter, that before President Kirkland left this part of the country, rumors were in circulation, relative to his accounts, of an unfavorable nature. His anxiety is such as to anticipate a charge, and not only by an *oral*, but by a *written* request, to authorise Mr. Lowell to appear in his defence. He did not request Mr. Bowditch, nor Mr. Gray, nor any of the existing Corporation, who could have spoken calmly and advisedly upon the subject, to do him this favor. He better knew his man.

But we have other evidence, besides that of Mr. Lowell, showing the existence of suspicions and rumors; evidence, which we deem it important to adduce for the special consideration of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College. The following queries first appeared in in the Boston Statesman. They were subsequently

re-published in a pamphlet, entitled "Facts and Documents in relation to Harvard College," p. 80.

"HARVARD COLLEGE.—As the Corporation of this venerable institution has lately elected a President, and as the state has a deep interest in the prosperity of the oldest and best endowed University in our country, it cannot be deemed unsuitable that the public should be satisfied on the following subjects.

1. Has there been a regular account of the pecuniary affairs of the College, specifying the sources of income, the actual receipts and the payments prepared from year to year, laid before the Corporation and the Board of Overseers?

2. Have any of the permanent funds of the College suffered encroachment or loss, by unskillful management, negligence, bad investments, or any other cause? and if so, how is a recurrence of the same evils to be prevented hereafter?

3. Have there been large balances in the hands of the most important agents of the College, which could not be accurately accounted for, however honestly these agents may have conducted themselves in the performance of their duties?

Let it be understood, that there are good reasons for proposing these questions; that the people of Massachusetts have a right to demand that they should be answered; that the Commonwealth has done more for the College during the period of one hundred and ninety years, than has been done by the public for all the other Colleges of New England; and that Legislators of the Commonwealth, are now, and ever have been, the proper visitors of the College.

A TRUE FRIEND OF THE COLLEGE.

January 23, 1829."

What reply was then, or ever, made to these queries? None—but that from voiceless silence. We know not the writer. But it is plain that there were queries proposed by some clear-headed, intelligent gentleman, who had access to sources of information, from which the public generally were excluded. The date of their appearance was, if we mistake not, a week previous to the publication of Mr. Cooke's pamphlet. Would the Treasurer of any large monied institution in Boston, whose books and accounts had been regularly and properly kept, suffer such queries to be proposed in a public paper, and to go unanswered and unnoticed? When similar suggestions were subsequently made by Mr. Cooke, Mr. Lowell and the Treasurer endeavor to retreat behind the prejudices of a religious party. We would yet hope there is too much intelligence, and too much integrity, in the Unitarian members of the Board of Overseers, to be the dupes of such an artifice.

We introduce an additional evidence, that every lingering doubt may be dissipated, and the subject present itself with such light and force as shall arrest the attention of those whose duty it is to see that the Republic receive no detriment. Our extract is from a communication dated January 29, 1829, and which appeared in the Boston Recorder with the signature of "Hollis."

"It is reported, apparently on good authority, that the funds of the College have not been managed, at all times, with the best economy. On this subject, orthodox people, of course, have no knowledge. If this report have any foundation, a thorough investigation might make disclosures which would not fully satisfy that community, who have been so profuse in bestowing their bounties.

This, however, is a proper subject of investigation by the Overseers, and I am not alone in earnestly hoping that the treasury department, for the twenty years past, will be thoroughly examined, and the manner in which the vast funds of this ancient institution have been managed, exhibited to the public, without reserve. The good people of this Commonwealth have a right to be made acquainted with this whole concern, and the people demand it.”*

It will not satisfy the public, for Mr. Lowell, after these repeated calls for definite information relative to the treasury of Harvard College, to cull out flowers from his historical reading, and play the rhetorician, when we call for the accountant.

The people of Massachusetts say, Show us your vouchers.

Mr. Lowell, “expressly authorised to defend Dr. Kirkland,” replies, You are reviving the scenes of Queen Mary.

People. Produce your books.

Mr. L. You intend to establish the inquisition.

People. Let us know definitely and distinctly how the immense appropriations we have made to the College have been expended.

Mr. L. You are kindling flames. You mean to bring us all to the stake.

People. Exhibit your accounts.

Mr. L. You are erecting a gibbet.

People. Where are the authorised orders for the several sums advanced by the Treasurer and Steward to the President?

Mr. L. Blood! Blood!!

We stated on the authority of Mr. Lowell, that, previous to the departure of President Kirkland from this part of the country, unfavorable rumors were in circulation, relative to his accounts. These rumors, it seems, were not quieted by his absence. Different writers in the Boston Statesman and Boston Recorder, a year since, called public attention to the same subject. These writers and their inquiries were passed by unnoticed, both by Mr. Lowell and the Treasurer, who was directly implicated by the queries proposed in the Statesman. Mr. Cooke in his pamphlet, published early in February, gave a more definite shape to these charges, than they had hitherto assumed. Still the Treasurer takes two months for deliberation, before he will publish the certificate of Mr. Nichols. His note to Mr. Hale is dated April 3d, 1829. Did he at times think and talk of prosecuting Mr. Cooke? If his note contained a false and a libellous accusation, why did he not prosecute him? Was he afraid of the truth in evidence? And does he expect to satisfy the public, to remove doubts, to silence inquiry, and arrest investigation, by an ambiguous certificate that, whatever it may mean, is superscribed and stamped with suspicion? This

* See “Facts and Documents,” p. 84.

cannot be. This must not be. The people of this State, whose treasures have been lavished to profusion on Harvard College, have a right to know how these treasures have been appropriated,—and *they will know*. Their voice now reaches the Senate chamber, and calls for investigation. And should any manœuvring or artifice cause it to be unheeded or slighted now, it may soon sound from the ballot boxes, with an emphasis of intonation sufficiently loud to be heard, and sufficiently authoritative to be obeyed. We call upon the Board of Overseers, who are about holding their semi-annual session, to investigate this subject thoroughly. Up to this moment, the Board of Overseers, as a body, are entirely ignorant of the manner in which the pecuniary concerns of the College have been managed for the last twenty years. Heretofore, their duties have been little more than nominal, and a few leading individuals behind the scenes, have directed and managed all their motions. This is, in general, an unavoidable result, in so cumbersome a body as this Board. The report of the Committee of the Board, appointed 10th June, 1826, which report is dated 10th January, 1828, derives all its value from the certificate of Mr. Nichols, which certificate, as we have already shown, in point of affording reasonable satisfaction, is worse than nothing. The time has come when this whole subject must be thoroughly investigated. To the Board of Overseers the people look with an expectation which must not be disappointed. In all probability, various artifices and contrivances will be resorted to, in the first place, to prevent an investigation; or should this be commenced, to throw dust and involve the subject in general ambiguities. In order to prevent investigation, it will no doubt be urged, either in public, or private, or both, that this is an *Orthodox party measure*. Now it ought to be known, and distinctly understood, that some distinguished Unitarians, some of the firmest supporters of Harvard College, are among the individuals who are most dissatisfied with the former management of its pecuniary concerns. All that the Orthodox know, and have published on this subject, has come from such individuals. Whether, then, the charges of Mr. Cooke are true or false, they originated with Unitarians, with Unitarian friends of Harvard College, by whose intelligence, integrity and decision, that institution was saved probably from bankruptcy. Let none attempt, then, to evade inquiry, by awakening prejudices against Orthodoxy.

We have purposely avoided recapitulating the inquiries proposed by Mr. Cooke, relative to the various sums expended during the administration of Dr. Kirkland. They are published and accessible. We are desirous that these, as well as those from the Boston

Statesman, may be publicly and definitely answered by those who are competent to speak with knowledge. We could propose some additional questions, that might come still nearer home, and carry a charge of a more heinous nature than any yet alleged ; but as we wish to know the whole and the simple truth of the case, and as this can be come at only by a full investigation, we prefer urging that, to all minor considerations. If these rumors and charges relative to the late President and Treasurer are false, and scandalous, they, of all men, will be most desirous of such an investigation ; but if there be foundation for these reports, then let no reverend name, nor honorable station, shield the delinquent or the culprit from public censure. Abused integrity will court inquiry. *Qui fugit judicium, opso teste reus est.*

(To be continued.)

SELECTIONS.

INTERESTING CONVERSIONS.

'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.' PAUL.

'Marvel not that I said unto thee, YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN.'

JESUS CHRIST.

As a striking practical comment on these interesting portions of Scripture, the following instances of conversion are selected. The subjects of them had too much intelligence to be easily deceived respecting the operations of their own minds, and too much integrity to be suspected of a design to deceive others ; and their subsequent course of life was such, as to evince the reality of the change they professed to have experienced. It must be gratifying, as well as profitable, to *ponder* the accounts which such men have left, respecting what they doubtless considered the most interesting and important events in their whole moral history.

PRESIDENT EDWARDS.

THIS distinguished divine was the subject of frequent solemn impressions, and was regular in the performance of religious duties, from his childhood. Soon after leaving college, when about seventeen years of age, he experienced a change in his affections, which he describes in the following manner :

“ From my childhood up, my mind had been full of objections against the doctrine of God’s sovereignty, in choosing whom he would to eternal life, and rejecting whom he pleased ; leaving them

eternally to perish. It used to appear like a horrible doctrine to me. But I remember the time very well, when I seemed to be convinced, and fully satisfied, as to the sovereignty of God, and his justice in thus eternally disposing of men, according to his sovereign pleasure.

“The first instance that I remember of that sort of inward, sweet delight in God and divine things that I have lived much in since, was on reading those words, ‘*Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever, Amen.*’ As I read the words, there came into my soul, and was as it were diffused through it, a sense of the glory of the Divine Being; a new sense, quite different from anything I ever experienced before. Never any words of Scripture seemed to me as these words did.

“From about that time, I began to have a new kind of apprehensions and ideas of Christ, and the work of redemption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. An inward, sweet sense of these things, at times, came into my heart; and my soul was led away in pleasant views and contemplations of them. And my mind was greatly engaged to spend my time in reading and meditating on Christ, on the beauty and excellency of his person, and the lovely way of salvation by free grace in him. I found no books so delightful to me, as those that treated of these subjects. The sense I had of divine things would often, of a sudden, kindle up, as it were, a sweet burning in my heart; an ardor of soul, that I know not how to express.

“Not long after I first began to experience these things, I gave an account to my father of some things that had passed in my mind. I was pretty much affected by the discourse we had together; and when the discourse was ended, I walked abroad alone, in a solitary place in my father’s pasture, for contemplation. And as I was walking there, and looking up on the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious *majesty* and *grace* of God, that I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction; majesty and meekness joined together; it was a sweet, and gentle, and holy majesty; and also a majestic meekness; an awful sweetness; a high, and great, and holy gentleness.

“After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and became more and more lively, and had more of that inward sweetness. The appearance of everything was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast, or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God’s excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in everything; in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water, and all nature; which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for continuance; and in the day spent much time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the

sweet glory of God in these things; in the mean time singing forth, with a low voice, my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer.

"I felt then great satisfaction as to my good state; but that did not content me. I had vehement longings of soul after God and Christ, and after more holiness, wherewith my heart seemed to be full, and ready to break; which often brought to my mind the words of the Psalmist, '*My soul breaketh for the longing it hath.*' I often felt a mourning and lamenting in my heart that I had not turned to God sooner, that I might have had more time to grow in grace. My mind was greatly fixed on divine things; almost perpetually in the contemplation of them. I spent most of my time in thinking of divine things, year after year; often walking alone in the woods and solitary places for meditation, soliloquy and prayer, and converse with God; and it was always my manner, at such times, to sing forth my contemplations. I was almost constantly in ejaculatory prayer, wherever I was. Prayer seemed to be natural to me, as the breath by which the inward burnings of my heart had vent."

WILLIAM COWPER.

MOST of our readers are acquainted with the early history of this gifted, amiable, but often unhappy man. He was constitutionally predisposed to melancholy and derangement, and while under deep convictions of sin, especially the sin of self-murder, which he had attempted, he fell into a state of complete despair. He gives the following account of his deliverance from this wretched state, after remaining in it for several months.

"I found the cloud of horror, which had so long hung over me, was every moment passing away; and every moment came fraught with hope. I was continually more and more persuaded that I was not utterly doomed to destruction. The way of salvation was still, however, hid from my eyes; nor did I see it at all clearer than before my illness. I only thought, that if it pleased God to spare me, I would lead a better life; and that I would yet escape hell, if a religious observance of my duty would secure me from it. Thus may the terror of the Lord make a pharisee; but only the sweet voice of mercy in the Gospel can make a Christian.

"But the happy period which was to shake off my fetters, and afford me a clear opening of the free mercy of God in Christ Jesus, was now arrived. I flung myself into a chair near the window, and seeing a Bible there, ventured once more to apply to it for comfort and instruction. The first verse I saw was the 25th of the third chapter of Romans: '*Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.*' Immediately I received strength to believe, and the full beams of the Sun of Righteousness shone upon me. I saw the

sufficiency of the atonement he had made, my pardon sealed in his blood, and all the fulness and completeness of his justification. In a moment I believed and received the Gospel. Whatever my friend Madan had said to me, so long before, revived in all its clearness, with demonstration of the Spirit and with power.

“Unless the Almighty arm had been under me, I think I should have died with gratitude and joy. My eyes filled with tears, and my voice choked with transport. I could only look up to heaven in silent fear, overwhelmed with love and wonder. But the work of the Holy Spirit is best described in his own words: it is ‘joy unspeakable, and full of glory.’ Thus was my heavenly Father in Christ Jesus pleased to give me the full assurance of faith; and, out of a strong, unbelieving heart, to ‘raise up a child unto Abraham.’ How glad should I now have been to have spent every moment in prayer and thanksgiving! I lost no opportunity of repairing to a throne of grace, but flew to it with an earnestness irresistible and never to be satisfied. Could I help it? Could I do otherwise than love and rejoice in my reconciled Father in Christ Jesus? The Lord had enlarged my heart, and ‘I ran in the way of his commandments.’

“For many succeeding weeks, tears were ready to flow if I did but speak of the Gospel, or mention the name of Jesus. To rejoice day and night was all my employment. Too happy to sleep much, I thought it was but lost time that was spent in slumber. Oh that the ardor of my first love had continued! But I have known many a lifeless and unhallowed hour since; long intervals of darkness, interrupted by short returns of peace and joy in believing.”

DAVID BRAINERD.

Brainerd, like President Edwards, was the subject of religious impressions from his early youth. He attended regularly to the duties of religion in public and in private, and earnestly sought to do something to recommend himself to the favor of Heaven. But being continually disappointed in attempts of this nature, his heart at length broke out into a violent and sensible quarrel with God. He was displeased with the strictness of the Divine law, with the prescribed and unalterable conditions of salvation, and especially with the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty. After continuing in this state for some considerable time, seeking rest and finding none, he was brought to acquiesce in those views of God, which he had formerly opposed, and to rejoice in hope of his glory.

“I was attempting to pray; but found no heart to engage in that or any other duty; my former concern, exercise, and religious affections were now gone. I thought that the Spirit of God had *quite* left me; but still was not distressed; yet disconsolate, as if there was nothing in heaven or earth could make me happy. Having been thus endeavoring to pray—though, as I thought, very stupid and senseless—for near half an hour; then, as I was walking in a

dark thick grove, *unspeakable glory* seemed to open to the view and apprehension of my soul. I do not mean any *external* brightness, for I saw no such thing; nor do I intend any imagination of a body of light, somewhere in the third heavens, or any thing of that nature; but it was a new inward apprehension or view that I had of *God*, such as I never had before, nor any thing which had the least resemblance of it. I stood still; wondered; and admired! I knew that I never had seen before any thing comparable to it for excellency and beauty; it was widely different from all the conceptions that ever I had of God, or things divine. I had no particular apprehension of any one person in the Trinity, either the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost; but it appeared to be *Divine glory*. My soul *rejoiced with joy unspeakable*, to see such a God, such a glorious divine Being; and I was inwardly pleased and satisfied, that he should be *God over all* for ever and ever. My soul was so captivated and delighted with the excellency, loveliness, greatness, and other perfections of God, that I was even swallowed up in him; at least to that degree, that I had no thought (as I remember) at *first*, about my own salvation, and scarce reflected that there was such a creature as myself.

“Thus God, I trust, brought me to a hearty disposition to *exalt him*, and set him on the throne, and principally and ultimately to aim at his honor and glory, as King of the universe. I continued in this state of inward joy, peace, and astonishment, till near dark, without any sensible abatement; and then began to think and examine what I had seen; and felt sweetly *composed* in my mind all the evening following. I felt myself in a new world, and every thing about me appeared with a different aspect from what it was wont to do. At this time, the *way of salvation* opened to me with such infinite wisdom, suitableness, and excellency, that I wondered I should ever think of any other way of salvation; was amazed that I had not dropped my own contrivances, and complied with this lovely, blessed, and excellent way before. If I could have been saved by my own duties, or any other way that I had formerly contrived, my whole soul would now have refused it. I wondered that all the world did not see and comply with this way of salvation, entirely by the *righteousness of Christ*. The sweet relish of what I then felt, continued with me for several days, almost constantly, in a greater or less degree.—I could not but sweetly rejoice in God, lying down and rising up.”

DR. SAMUEL HOPKINS, OF NEWPORT.

Dr. Hopkins was a self-righteous and confident professor of religion, for some time before he came to a saving knowledge of the truth. He was awakened to a deep sense of his true character and danger, while a member of Yale College, through the instrumentality of David Brainerd.

“My conviction fixed upon me. I saw I was indeed no christian. The evil of my heart, the hardness and unbelief of it came more

and more into view; and the evil case in which I was, appeared more and more dreadful. I felt myself a guilty, justly condemned creature, and my hope of relief by obtaining conversion failed more and more, and my condition appeared darker from day to day, and all help failed, and I felt myself to be nothing but ignorance, guilt and stupidity. Thus I continued for some weeks, generally retired, unless when I attended private meetings of young people for prayer, &c., which were frequent then in college, and in the town.

"At length, as I was in my closet one evening, while I was meditating, and in my devotions, a new and wonderful scene opened to my view. I had a sense of the being and presence of God, as I never had before; it being more of a reality, and more affecting and glorious, than I had ever before perceived. And the character of Jesus Christ, the mediator came into view, and appeared such a reality, and so glorious, and the way of salvation by him so wise, important and desirable, that I was astonished at myself that I had never seen these things before, which were so plain, pleasing and wonderful. I longed to have all see and know these things as they now appeared to me. I was greatly affected, in the view of my own depravity, the sinfulness, guilt, and odiousness of my character; and tears flowed in great plenty. After some time I left my closet, and went into the adjoining room, no other person being then there. I walked the room, all intent on these subjects, and took up Watts' version of the psalms, and opened it at the fifty-first psalm, and read the first, second and third parts in long metre with strong affections, and made it all my own language, and thought it was the language of my heart to God; I dwelled upon it with pleasure, and wept much. And when I had laid the book aside, my mind continued fixed on the subject, and in the exercise of devotion, confession, adoration, petition, &c., in which I seemed to pour out my heart to God with great freedom. I continued all attention to the things of religion, in which most appeared more or less engaged. There were many instances, as was then supposed, of conversion. I felt a peculiar, pleasing affection to those, who were supposed to be christians."

ANDREW FULLER.

IN his youth, this excellent man had frequent convictions of sin, and frequent struggles between his inclinations and his conscience, between the strivings of the Holy Spirit, and the suggestions of his evil heart. He often spent his evenings in vain and sinful company, to which he was strongly attached, and on leaving which he was uniformly in great distress.

"One morning," says he, "I think in November, 1769, I walked out by myself with an unusual load of guilt upon my conscience. The remembrance of my sin, not only on the past evening, but for a long time back, the breach of my vows, and the

shocking termination of my former hopes and affections, all uniting together, formed a burden which I knew not how to bear. The reproaches of a guilty conscience seemed like the gnawing worm of hell. I do not write in the language of exaggeration. I now know that the sense which I then had of the evil of sin, and the wrath of God, was very far short of the truth; but yet it seemed more than I was able to sustain. In reflecting upon my broken vows, I saw that there was no truth in me. I saw that God would be perfectly just in sending me to hell, and that to hell I must go, unless I were saved of mere grace, and as it were in spite of myself. I felt, that if God were to forgive me all my past sins, I should again destroy my soul, and that, in less than a day's time. I never before knew what it was to feel myself an odious, lost sinner, standing in need of both pardon and purification. I knew not what to do! I durst not promise amendment; for I saw such promises were self-deception. To hope for forgiveness in the course that I was in, was the height of presumption; and to think of Christ, after having so basely abused his grace, seemed too much. So I had no refuge. As near as I can remember, I was like a man drowning, looking every way for help, or rather, catching for something by which he might save his life. I tried to find whether there were any hope in the divine mercy, any in the Saviour of sinners; but felt repulsed by the thought of mercy having been so basely abused already. In this state of mind, as I was moving slowly on, I thought of the resolution of Job, 'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.' I paused, and repeated the words over and over. Each repetition seemed to kindle a ray of hope, mixed with a determination, *if I might*, to cast my perishing soul upon the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation, to be both pardoned and purified; for I felt that I needed the one as much as the other. In this way I continued above an hour, weeping and supplicating mercy for the Saviour's sake: (my soul hath it still in remembrance, and is humbled in me!) and as the eye of the mind was more and more fixed upon him, my guilt and fears were gradually and insensibly removed. I now found rest for my troubled soul.

"When I thought of my past life, I abhorred myself, and repented as in dust and ashes; and when I thought of the Gospel way of salvation, I drank it in as cold water is imbibed by a thirsty soul. My heart felt one with Christ, and dead to every other object around me.

"From this time, my former wicked courses were forsaken. I had no manner of desire after them. They lost their influence upon me. To those evils, a glance at which before would have set my passions in a flame, I now felt no inclination. 'My soul' (said I, with joy and triumph,) 'is as a weaned child!' I now knew, experimentally, what it was to be dead to the world by the cross of Christ, and to feel an habitual determination to devote my future life to God my Saviour."

SAMUEL J. MILLS.

MR. MILLS was one of the most extraordinary characters which America has produced. Unobtrusive and unobserved, he caused his influence to be felt (and it was ever a good influence) in exciting and directing most of the great religious movements of the day. With him, while a member of college, the spirit of Foreign Missions in this country may be said to have originated. He set on foot the Foreign Mission School, and the mission to the Sandwich Islands. "He matured the plan, which eventuated in the establishment of the United Foreign Missionary Society." The formation of the American Bible Society "Mr. Mills thought of, and suggested, and pressed the suggestion, long before it probably entered the mind of any other individual." By his repeated and extended travels in the southern and western portions of our country, to search out and make known the spiritual wants of the people, he was as instrumental in arousing the spirit of Domestic Missions, as he had previously been in exciting interest in behalf of the heathen. His agency, too, in originating and maturing the plans of the American Colonization Society, in the furthering of which he lost his life, can never be forgotten by the friends of Africa.

The spiritual career of this devoted servant of Christ and the church commenced in the following manner: When about fifteen years of age, his attention was specially directed to the great concerns of the soul. For two full years, he continued in a state of anxiety, quarreling with the sovereignty of God, and often wishing that he had never been born. One morning, as he was about to leave home, to return to school in a neighboring town, his pious "mother took an opportunity of inquiring into the state of his mind, and begged him to make an ingenuous disclosure of his feelings."

"For a moment he was silent, and wept; but his heart was too full long to suppress the emotions produced by so affecting a request. He raised his head, and, with eyes streaming with tears, exclaimed, "O that I had never been born! O that I had never been born! For two years I have been sorry God ever made me." What reply could such a mother make to such a disclosure? It was given her in that same hour what she should speak:—"My son," said she, "you *are* born, and you can never throw off your existence, nor your everlasting accountability for all your conduct." This heavy thought was like a dagger to his soul. His mother expressed her fears that he had never thoroughly seen the evil of his own heart, and that he had much to learn before he was acquainted with himself:—to which he ventured to say, "*I have seen—to the very bottom of hell!*" With this frame of mind, he took a melancholy leave of his parents for the winter; and it was a day never to be forgotten in the life of Mr. Mills, nor in our recollection of those splendid schemes of benevolence which characterized his subsequent history, and to which the events of this day bore so intimate a relation. What took place under his father's roof may be easily conjectured;—a scene, apparently of very little moment,

and never unveiled till now—a scene the world would scarcely deign to look at, but one on which God looks down with smiles—a scene, in which no prince or princess is the actor, but one which princes might come down from their thrones to emulate :—a devout and humble woman, wrestling with the Angel of the Covenant, and as a prince obtaining power to prevail!

“The farewell to his mother drove her to her knees. There is such a thing as special faith in prayer. It was such to this dear saint, when she went to plead for her poor son. She felt his sorrows and her own; and God was pleased not only to show her that all her help was in him, but to enable her to feel that to him could her heart turn as her only God in covenant, and from him could she find unutterable relief. She did not leave her closet, till she found the full relief she sought, and till her mind was confidently assured that God would remember mercy for her child! It ought to be recorded, that on that very morning, it pleased the Holy Ghost, as she afterwards ascertained, to knock off the chains from this unhappy prisoner, and introduce him into the liberty of the sons of God. He had not gone far, before he had such a view of the perfections of God, that he wondered he had never seen their beauty and glory before. There was nothing in God now which distressed him. He had lost all his opposition to the divine sovereignty; and such were his views of this adorable perfection, that he could not refrain from exclaiming, ‘O glorious sovereignty! O glorious sovereignty!’ He retired a small distance into the woods, that he might be the more at liberty to contemplate the character of God, and adore and extol his holy and amiable sovereignty: but he here saw so much of God, that his mind was almost lost in the overwhelming manifestation. The scene was altogether new. There was a wonderful change either in God or in him. Everything was gilded with light and glory; and now and then, as he gazed at the splendor and majesty of the divine character, he would still exclaim, ‘O glorious sovereignty!’ It does not appear that in all this he was bribed into acquiescence. ‘His mind was so constantly occupied in viewing the perfections of God, and in meditating on his word and works, and so continued for several weeks, that he did not think of himself with any degree of concern.’ Such is the nature of genuine religion. It is far from being indispensable to our cordial acquiescence in God’s character and government, to be persuaded that we are interested in his mercy.”*

* A new and revised edition of the *Memoir of Mr. Mills* has been recently issued from the press of Messrs. Perkins and Marvin of this city, and well deserves the attention of the religious public.

AMUSEMENTS.

From the Spirit and Manners of the Age.

AT a time when the mental resources of individuals were far more limited than they are now, cards were introduced to remove the *ennui* of the social scene. A taste for literature and science has operated, it is true, to their exclusion from many companies where they were once cordially admitted; but, unhappily, their influence is still very extensive. The writer has not unfrequently heard the question mooted of late, 'What harm is there in cards?' Nor is he conscious of any difficulty in meeting the interrogation. —Is there no harm, it may be replied, in the sacrifice of time? Are so many precious hours to be squandered with impunity? It cannot be.

"Time, the supreme!—Time is eternity;
Pregnant with all eternity can give;
Pregnant with all that makes archangels smile;
Who murders time, he crushes in the birth
A power etherial, only not adored."

The excitement of corrupt feelings, and the worst passions of the human bosom, must also be mentioned. Who that is fond of 'play,' has not marked the baleful look of scorn? Who has not observed the rising, perhaps the dominance of anger? Who has not listened to mutual recriminations, to the boisterous triumphs of selfishness, and to expressions which announced the subjugation of every benevolent emotion? And who does not know that the course of gaming may be traced in perfidy and blood? Instances are numerous in which, like a fearful vortex, it has engulfed honor, fortune, character, and life. Many a wretch, who now paces the streets in abject penury, could tell of overwhelming losses to which the *domestic card-table* was the precursor. Many an orphan is struggling with insuperable difficulties, because his guardian, enchained by this vice, most treacherously betrayed his trust. And many a widow is there, whose countenance accords with the sabbleness of her attire, and from whose eyes would gush a torrent, were you to allude to that which made her dearest friend a suicide. It is granted that the results of this recreation, as it is termed, are not always of this dismal character; but it must be maintained, that in no case whatever are they favorable to the interests of morality, and that, to be safe from the bite of a venomous reptile, it should be crushed in the egg. He who would avoid precipitation to the base of a rock, must not trifle on the summit; and on this principle we are required, by the highest authority, to 'abstain from all appearance of evil.' No sooner do we look without dismay on the semblance of what is wrong, than we are in danger of sinking into the full reality, though we might previously have regarded it with abhorrence.

“Vice is a creature of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen ;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.”

It is, therefore, at best but an ingenious fallacy to contend, that because persons play in private parties, or for small sums, no injury can arise ; since, by so doing, an avenue is kept open for all the pestiferous accompaniments of an ensnaring, and often fatal amusement.

Of *dancing* it would be unjust and injurious to speak in mild and equivocal terms. Nothing can be more absurd than the pretext for its necessity so commonly stated, that it is indispensable to easy and graceful manners ; for many are destitute of them who have been initiated by fashionable teachers, and others, who have not been, have possessed this attraction. Were it otherwise, the result ought to be inestimably valuable, to be commensurate with the *inevitable* sacrifice. Of what may a woman, entering the public assembly in all the charms of loveliness, so well remind us, as the victim of former times, garlanded with flowers, approaching the altar ? Health, which casts over that countenance so many beautiful hues, and which gives to that step so much elasticity and firmness, *must* suffer, and *may* be lost, in such midnight revelries. To this, the usual attire may greatly contribute, while it cannot be assumed without impairing the delicacy of its wearer ; giving scope to the feelings of pride, and to the love of display, which it is of vast importance to repress, and assisting to induce habits of extravagance at variance with honor and peace. Nor can it be denied that other emotions frequently have birth, of an order, if possible, more exceptionable. Struggles for precedence, the exultation attendant on personal distinction, the proud consciousness of superiority in dress, in skill, or in immediate association ; the efforts at mortifying others, which frequently inflame the passions, and violently agitate the whole frame, and betray a state of mind and of heart which every lover of his species should strive to avert. Strange is the infatuation which conceals the fact, that every departure from the appropriate sphere of moral principle makes way for others ; and that the most fearful consequences may result from an aberration which once seemed inconsiderable. Still more so is it when it is not seen, that, having proceeded far from the line of rectitude, the individual is in imminent danger of a lapse, which once would have been deemed impossible. Not unfrequently do the public journals describe to us some of the miseries of violated engagements, and heart-rending scenes of pollution and woe, which had never met the eye of the mind, had it not been for the vain imagination that a small part of what is manifestly evil may be good ;—had not circumstances been permitted and applauded, in which they undoubtedly originated.

The limits of this paper will allow of but few remarks on theatrical representations; and indeed, they would be inappropriate to its subject, since they have no solid claim to the character of amusements. For recreation, we must repair to other sources. The stage can neither relieve the mind from severe attention, nor recruit the animal spirits by an agreeable suspension of effort; its effort, on the contrary, is the excitement of the passions, which is always attended by a feverish restlessness, and followed by painful exhaustion. A sanguine hope is entertained by many that the attractions of the theatre are on the decline. It is an interesting feature of the present age, that notwithstanding every exertion on the part of managers in our towns, they often receive much less encouragement than they have been accustomed to experience. And there are reasons for thinking that this will be increasingly the case, from the want of dramatic *materiel*. Tragedy has long been on the wane, and Comedy is now rapidly declining. Not a few characters which amused the play-goers of thirty or forty years ago, are too gross to be tolerated now, when the licentiousness of speech and compositions, then so common, is becoming extremely rare. In the lapse of years, there has been not only an improvement in delicacy of feeling, but also a diminution of those personal peculiarities, to the embodying of which the actor looks for his highest fascination and applause. In the intercourse, and especially the mental improvement of society, a sort of homogeneity of character has been induced, which will render difficult the comedians finding new parts, and which will give to many of those now exhibited with eclat, an unnatural air. A glimpse of a period in which the influence of the stage shall be greatly diminished, is truly animating to a benevolent mind. Those who are acquainted with its history, drawn not by the hand of interested panegyrists, but by that of truth, need entertain no apprehension that a commensurate evil can arise from its ruins. On the contrary, when the sound is heard, "It is fallen," the most powerful engine ever devised for the destruction of man's dearest interests will have been demolished.

If it is asked on what principle amusements should be selected, the words of an eminent individual will furnish an appropriate reply:—"If there is something wholesome in them which almost refuses corruption; if the advantage they produce balance their mischief; if by scattering their oils around, they contribute to smooth, without poisoning the waves of life; if their direct or chance expense does not break in upon that treasury which every man keeps for his neighbor; if they are not so closely allied to the amusements of the bad as to break down the wall of partition between us and them; if they have no tendency to wean society from more profitable employments; if, lastly, they do not encroach on that handful of time bestowed on man to do the business of eternity.—If all this be true of any of them, I will say of him who uses them, he may be a Christian, and a good Christian, but I shall think him the most distin-

guished Christian who uses them the least. The good, like the great man, (why, alas! are not the terms convertible?) will ever seek his pleasures in the field of his duties, and, though he *suffers* mere amusement, will seldom *court* it."

THE CHARACTER AND MISERY OF AN IRRELIGIOUS YOUTH.

From the (English) Youth's Magazine.

"I never look at an irreligious young person," observed a most pious and estimable individual, "without cherishing a feeling of pure and unmixed pity; and when I think of the idle habits he forms, of the improper associations he cultivates, of the unsubstantial and pernicious pleasures he pursues, and of the *amount of good* he might be rendered instrumental in securing, were he governed by the principles of the Gospel, the impression produced on my mind, is at once mournful and overpowering." This remark is equally just and incontrovertible, though at the same time, it is scarcely possible for us to assent to its truth, without being the subjects of depressing and painful emotions. I do not feel solicitous to lessen the dignity of youth; to deface the beauty and tarnish the lustre of the youthful character; or to indulge in censorious and splenetic remarks, in relation to the habits, the conversation, the deportment, and "the ruling passions" of young people; but it must excite the profound and unmingled regret of every person of sober and accurate reflection, and especially of enlightened and devout feeling, to perceive so inconsiderable a number of those, who are encircled by all the beauty, richness, and splendor of "the vernal season of life," sitting at the feet of Jesus; breathing the lovely and celestial spirit of the Gospel; discovering that humility, decision, energy, sweet simplicity of character, and entire consecration of their powers, attainments, and resources, to the divine Redeemer, by which commanding features a child of God is at once beautified and distinguished.

Young people, who have left 'vanity fair;' whose conversation is emphatically in heaven; whose tone of hallowed and devout feeling is at once unequivocal and commanding; who discover the mind of Christ wherever they go; and who are unceasingly solicitous to exhibit the matchless beauty and the unsearchable riches of Jesus to those around them, without any regard to age, sex, or capacity, are, in the most painful sense, "strangers in the earth"—resembling green and fertile spots in the desert of human life; and while these are beauteous and luxuriant, all around discovers complete drought, aridity, and desolation.

As a minister of Christ, when I meet with young persons, I do not feel desirous of knowing, in the first place, whether they possess a variety of exterior or minor attractions. I like to meet with a youth of intelligence, who is extensively acquainted with literature and

science, and who has perused with attention and delight the publications of our best authors. I like to converse with a young person of genuine talent, whose taste has been diligently cultivated, whose judgement is vigorous, whose understanding is comprehensive, and whose tone of thinking is manly and powerful. I like to meet with an amiable youth, who discovers the utmost urbanity of manners, kindness of feeling, and loveliness of disposition towards all with whom he associates. I am happy in meeting with an accomplished and interesting female, who is conversant with the polite arts, and who blends simplicity and modesty with all her accomplishments; but if the spirit of the Saviour be wanting, we may most appropriately and emphatically apply the language of the wise man, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." That is wanted, without which young people, however intelligent, gifted, amiable, and accomplished, are poor and miserable, blind and naked—in a state of complete spiritual destruction—of mournful wretchedness—of deep and fatal ignorance—and without provision for life, death, or eternity.

An irreligious youth is a pitiable object, because he is devoid of that, which he indispensably and uniformly requires. He is traversing a wilderness; consequently he wants one who is qualified to conduct him, to preserve him from peril, to cheer and invigorate his spirits, and to stimulate him onwards amidst all the difficulties and calamities of the way. He is in a trackless forest, and he will find it utterly impossible to penetrate its profound and numerous recesses, and to escape the imminent and fearful dangers by which he is encompassed, unless one be with him, who is perfectly acquainted with the intricacies of the way, and who can follow all its windings, and avert all its evils. A young person, while he continues below, is in the enemy's country, where there are numerous snares laid; the most subtle temptations presented; and the most alluring and fascinating inducements held out; consequently he requires "the wisdom which cometh down from above;" which is divine in its nature, unerring in its directions, and most efficacious in its influence. He wants armour, and the Christian panoply is the only defence that will render him invulnerable. He wants "the sword of the Spirit," and the shield of faith, or else he will be easily vanquished by his deadly foes.

If these remarks be accurate, the writer of this unpretending essay is perfectly warranted in affirming, that an irreligious youth is, morally and spiritually, in a state of utter and dreadful destitution. He wants the best principles to govern him; the best feelings to purify him, the best motives to incite him; the best guide to direct him; the best friend to cheer and invigorate him; the best armor to constitute a sure and constant defence; the best enjoyments to compose and animate him; amidst all the afflictions and calamities of time; and the best hopes to brighten the passage that conducts to the tomb, and to unfold to his astonished and enraptured view, the unclouded splendors of immortality. My beloved young friends, be assured by one, who writes at least in his own humble estimation sincerely and experimentally on this subject, that it is the approving

and benignant smile of Jesus, which constitutes the felicity of earth, and the unmingled bliss of the celestial Paradise ; and if you feel any solicitude that moral beauty should be imparted to your character ; that a halo of pure and resplendent glory should encircle your brow ; that true, indeed divine, dignity should be associated with your plans, habits and proceedings ; that substantial and exquisite enjoyment should be realized, amidst all the fluctuations of time, and all the calamities that are incident to mortality ; that perfect security should be possessed in the season of difficulty, in the period of temptation, in the chamber of suffering, and in the event of nature's dissolution, you must bear an evident and a striking resemblance to that matchless Saviour, who is emphatically " the chief among ten thousands, and the altogether lovely." I uniformly commiserate the mournful condition of a *man* devoid of the spirit of the Gospel, because I know, that if he is not wretched *now*, the period will speedily arrive, when wretchedness will be his portion forever ; but when I see a profane or an impious *youth*, my feelings of commiseration are, if possible, still more powerfully excited."

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *First Lessons in Intellectual Philosophy, or a Familiar Explanation of the Nature and Operations of the Human Mind.* First American Edition, adapted to the use of Schools. By Rev. SILAS BLAISDALE. Boston : Lincoln & Edmands, 1829. pp. 358.

The science of Intellectual Philosophy has been not unfrequently regarded as of too abstruse a character, and as, at present, in too unsettled a state, to merit much attention from any but professed students. The " First Lessons" are however an attempt to exhibit the general principles of the science, in a form adapted to common use, and presented in such a manner as to be attractive to the young. The conversational form, so popular for other similar purposes, has been adopted. The work is perhaps rather remarkable for a copiousness and felicity of illustration, which elucidates almost every topic, and gives variety and interest to the whole. The system of Dr. Brown constitutes the basis of the arrangement ; the truths are however presented in a style and manner quite the reverse of his, and questions are added at the bottom of every page, for the benefit of learners.

A word in regard to the two objections above mentioned, as sometimes made against the general introduction of this study. First, its abstruseness, instead of an objection, is quite the reverse. It enables the science to furnish a discipline to the *thinking powers*, which nothing else can give, and prepares the mind to enter upon the consideration of moral subjects, with far greater energy and effect.

As to the uncertainty attending metaphysical inquiries, there is far less of it than is often supposed. It is well known that the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh has been almost the throne of Metaphysics, for England and America. The successive monarchs of the dynasty have each endeavored to erect his empire, in some degree, at least, upon the ruins of his predecessor's, and each has generally bestowed as much of his attention upon the *little* which he wished to demolish, as upon the *far greater portion* which he was ready to confirm. Men frequently dwell with more interest upon the few points on which they differ, than upon the many in which they agree; and the metaphysical philosophers have brought out a few spots of debatable ground, into a far more conspicuous rank than they deserve, when compared with the extensive regions of which they have settled and harmonious possession, and which are of undoubted beauty and fruitfulness. These regions, the work of which we are speaking designs to occupy; and they are, almost entirely, regions of unquestioned truth.

2. *The Veracity of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, when compared, first, with each other, and second, with Josephus.* By the Rev. J. J. BLUNT, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, (England.) First American Edition. Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1829. pp. 127.

We have read this treatise with great satisfaction, and feel a pleasure in recommending it to the perusal of others.

The general argument, in its nature and objects, is substantially the same with that pursued in reference to other portions of the New Testament, by Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*—a work with which every one should be familiarly acquainted. It is a popular argument, and in the common concerns of life, has great influence. In courts of Justice, coincidence of circumstances, goes farther than almost anything else, to establish the credibility of witnesses with a jury. The principle involved in this argument is this: In all spurious writings, agreement is the effect of contrivance or design, and consequently, to use the words of Paley, "*In examining the agreement between ancient writings, the character of truth and originality is undesignedness.*" The more indirect, minute, or circuitous any coincidences may appear, the greater the evidence that they are not the effect of design. A coincidence in the productions of independent writers may be minute without being uncertain, unobserved without being obscure, and oblique without being forced or fanciful.

It is not our object, however, to give an exposition of this argument. Its nature and objects will be best seen, and its force most readily felt, by attentively perusing the treatise before us. The undesigned coincidences here noticed establish, beyond all controversy, the fact, that the writers of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, were independent witnesses of the facts which they relate, and that each wrote from personal knowledge of his subject;

and they cannot be contemplated, with the incidental remarks accompanying them, without a conviction, or an increased *persuasion*, that the writings in which they are contained are true. None, of common intelligence, will begin to read this work, without finishing it. We hope it may have, as it deserves, an extensive circulation.

3. *Macarius; or Memoirs of a Naval Officer.* Boston: Peirce and Williams. 1830. pp. 54.

The story of Macarius is extracted from the *Retrospect*, a work published several years since in this city, and may be familiar to some of our readers. But those who are most familiar with it will, we doubt not, be most gratified to learn that it is now published, with notes and an appendix, in a little manual by itself. It shows the excellence and power of religion, as exemplified in scenes of peculiar temptation, and of great spiritual trial and conflict. It presents an instance of untiring diligence in professional business, amidst the toils and perils of the deep, united with unabated fervency of spirit in serving the Lord. It will be read with interest by all classes of Christians, but is specially adapted, as it is designed, for circulation among seamen. All the profits derived from it will be given to the American Seamen's Friend Society, for promoting the objects of that important institution. We sincerely hope it may increase the sympathies of Christians in behalf of naval men, by showing that a life of godliness is practicable and lovely even in them; and that it may promote the spiritual good of many who go down to the sea in ships, and do business on the mighty waters. Then both the author and the compiler will find that reward which, we doubt not, is dearest to their hearts.

4. *Essays on the Present Crisis in the Condition of the American Indians*; first published in the *National Intelligencer*, under the signature of William Penn. Boston; Perkins and Marvin. 1829. pp. 112.

We read most of these essays, while they were going the rounds of newspaper circulation; and have again perused them, since their collection and re-publication in their present form. And to say that we are satisfied, gratified, and thankful to their author for the labor he has bestowed on them, is not enough. Our feelings constrain us to pause, and render thanksgiving to Almighty God, the Fountain of light, and Author of all wisdom, grace, and strength, that he has *enabled* the writer of these papers, whoever he may be, so clearly and successfully to investigate the subject in question, and to rear such a munition of facts and arguments, such a rampart of fire, around the threatened, but sacred enclosure of Indian rights. Perhaps no papers of a similar character have been so frequently published, and so extensively circulated in the United States, as these. Still we are glad to see them collected in their present form. They

are too valuable to be left to the transient and perishable columns of a newspaper. They ought to be preserved, and transmitted to other countries, and to future generations, that, if the impending destruction be brought upon the Indians, it may be known that a solemn and enlightened testimony was borne against it, and that those who perpetrated or *permitted* the deed of oppression, did it with their eyes open.

To think of *replying* to the considerations here urged, is out of the question. It is manifestly impossible, and never will be seriously attempted. We hope our national legislators will be individually and severally served with a copy of this pamphlet. We hope they may take the time and the trouble to read it. We hope the collisions of party and passion may for a season subside, and that the still small voice of reason and conscience may be regarded. We hope and pray, that those, who will be called to decide the questions here discussed, may pause and consider before they do that which, once done, can never be undone, and which will be sure to draw down upon this great nation the reproaches of men, and the just judgements of God,

5. *A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Rev. Matthias Bruen*, preached in Bleecker-street Church, New-York, September 20, 1829. By THOMAS H. SKINNER. New-York; J. Seymour. 1829. pp. 48.

This discourse was delivered at the united request of the bereaved Church of the lamented Bruen, and of the Executive Committee of the American Home Missionary Society. From the declaration of the Evangelist, 'This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God,' the author was led to show, "How the saints die; and how they glorify God by their death." In general, it may be said,

"That the saints are in death what they were in life, only, as their circumstances are then wholly and wonderfully peculiar, there is a corresponding peculiarity in their exercises and deportment. Death finds them what they are, and does not make them different, but only gives them occasion for new and extraordinary displays of their character. Their dying conduct, like their living, is stamped with 'holiness to the Lord.' Whether their last hours are full of victory and mighty joy; or are only calm and peaceful; or are hours of alternate temptation and triumph, darkness and light; they are hours when the spirit still obeys the divine will as the law of her being; still confesses her guilt and abases herself before the infinite Majesty and purity of God; still witnesses her supreme love of the divine excellence, her adoring gratitude for redemption, her self-renouncing faith in the great Sacrifice for the sins of the world, her unshaken confidence in the promises of holy scripture, her utter disrelish and loathing of the world as a portion, her supreme longing after perfect holiness, her heaviness and sorrow for impenitent perishing men, her assurance of a resurrection of the body, and of the complete and changeless blessedness of the righteous, and misery of the wicked. These are the elements of the saint's character in life, and they remain the same when he is dying, only they shine out then with a lustre as unwonted as the occasion."

Saints glorify God in their death, as in their life, by the exercise and manifestation of holy affections.

"The power of exemplified holiness rises in proportion to the severity of its trial. God is glorified indeed, when he is glorified in the fires of adversity. In the light of these fires, holiness shines above any other brightness seen in the earth. But the supreme of evils, the KING of terrors, the horror of the whole living creation, is DEATH—a name that stands for every thing appalling in earth and in hell.—And does the holiness of the saints prevail even against this adversary? Does it meet and conquer, and in a sense abelish this last and chiefest foe? Does it put on its brightest forms of mildness, and majesty, and gladness, and triumph, as it joins itself in conflict with this leviathan of the universe? It does, my brethren; and here is the glory which the saints give to God: here is the excellency of power, the completion of moral evidence, the most efficient of all testimonies to the truth, the importance, the infinite worth, the absolute necessity of religion; the loudest of all protests against the crime and madness of a worldly life."

After several interesting reflections, Dr. S. proceeds to a more direct application of the subject, and to give a brief account of the life, the character, the dying agonies, and the abounding spiritual consolations, of his departed brother. Gladly would we extract all that he has said on this subject, that we might leave on our pages a memorial of one so extensively and deservedly beloved. We must confine ourselves, however, to two or three passages, setting forth his intellectual and Christian character, and his religious sentiments.

"As to his intellectual character, he was so peculiar, that I have in vain endeavored to put him into any class. The aspect of his mind, like his countenance, was beautiful; its motions were easy, energetic, quick. He had a sprightly and fertile fancy; a pure taste; an acute and accurate discernment of the force of an argument, the spirit of his author, the beauties and deformities of composition. He loved literature rather than science; strength rather than logical precision; despatch and rapidity in discourse, rather than minute and extended analysis. It was astonishing, the ease and success with which he thought. What fine specimens of composition has he left us, written in about as many hours as others would have deemed sufficient labor for the same number of days. His sermons, always full of beauty, and often too, full of learning, (that is, if the proper proof of learning in discourse be abundant allusions which only learning can make,) were generally the product of a day, and sometimes of a sitting. With such facility and speed he accomplished every thing. His manner of writing was better suited to the press than the pulpit, and his elocution discovered too much modesty and diffidence for the happiest effect. As a public speaker he was rapidly rising, and promised to be second to almost none of his brethren, as an eloquent and efficient advocate of the cause of our benevolent societies."

"His reading in divinity extended through the various systems; and he neither received as truth, nor rejected as error, what he had not considered in its polemical connexions. He understood and embraced the faith usually called Calvinistic; but not with such a persuasion of having seen the whole truth, as hindered the continuance of free and independent research. Hence he was constantly making accessions to the light, and diminishing the remaining darkness and inconsistency of his theological scheme. The changes which took place in his creed ought rather to be called modifications or corrections—they related to the philosophy, not to the facts and essential doctrines of religion; and were such as gave him freedom, pungency, and practical power in the pulpit."

"He had more fear than confidence, in regard to his spiritual state, though he felt and confessed the obligation to be assured of his calling and election. He was more ready to hear than to tell of spiritual manifestations and comforts—happier in the eminent attainments of others, than in his own measures of spirituality and grace. He loved revivals of religion; rejoiced in opportunities to put himself under their peculiar power, rendered God praise for their prevalence, and constantly prayed for their increase; but yet lamented that he had not more of the spirit of revivals, and was so afraid of his unfitness to labor where these extraordinary effusions of the Spirit were enjoyed, that he tremblingly entered upon any public service in such places.

"He was aware of the peculiar temptations to an unspiritual kind of religion that belong to the elevated circumstances and sphere of life for which he was fitted and disposed by his cast of character, connexions, attainments, and advantages; and he was conscious that his communion with God and his religious joy were not promoted by intercourse with the worldly great and honorable. The best associates he knew to be the most spiritual minded; and from the heartless smiles and courtesies of the world, with what delight did he return to the humble circle of prayerful and devoted christians. Goodness was before greatness, nearness to God before the greatest elevation among men, according to his judgment, his feeling, and his actual preference. He had no alliances or intercourse with men of distinction, which hindered him from loving and delighting in the society of holy persons, however obscure. He abjured fashionable amusements, and loved the house of mourning rather than the house of feasting."

7. *The Proper Mode of Conducting Missions to the Heathen.*
A Sermon delivered before the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others in North America, Nov. 5, 1829. By BENJAMIN B. WISNER, Pastor of the Old South Church in Boston. Boston: Putnam and Hunt. 1829. pp. 44.

The Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others in North America was incorporated by the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1787. Its charter requires that "the incomes or profits" of its funds be "applied to the purposes of propagating the Gospel among the Indians in North America, and also among other people who, through poverty or other circumstances, are destitute of the means of religious instructions." The number of persons named in the act of incorporation, as originally constituting the society, is twenty-one, who, "*with such others as they shall elect,*" were made a body politic, and empowered to "purchase and hold in succession, lands, tenements, and real estate of any kind, the annual income and profit not to exceed the value of two thousand pounds." At the time of the incorporation of this society, the existence of Unitarianism in this region was unavowed, if not unknown. The whole number of members at this time, according to the list appended to the last annual report, is thirty-five. Ever since Unitarianism in this region was brought to light, in 1815, there has been, as there is now, a majority of Unitarians in this society. Yet it always elected an Orthodox select committee, and all the missionaries appointed by it, with possibly one exception, were, so far as we have been able to ascertain, Orthodox, till since the death of its late President, the Hon. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, who left

the society a legacy of \$5000. At the annual meeting which took place on the week of his funeral, no change was made. But the next year, the character of the select committee was reversed. And, if we are correctly informed, the only two new missionaries that have been appointed since that time, and previous to the late annual meeting, were Unitarians. One of them, the Rev. Mr. BRIMBLE-COME of Norridgewock, Me., soon after his appointment, avowed himself a Universalist, and joined the Universalist Convention of Maine. For this act he has been stricken from the list of missionaries of this society, with what consistency can be best told by its liberal members, who, of course, hold that no man is to be censured for his religious opinions. We were quite disappointed at finding no treasurer's report published the present year; for we hold it to be of the utmost importance that all our benevolent societies account regularly and fully to the public for the funds committed to their trust. From the report for 1827, it appears that, in November of that year, the society had a permanent fund of \$28,700, the "probable income" of which was stated to be \$1659. To this has since been added the legacy of the late Hon. William Phillips, \$5,000, making a total amount of permanent funds, \$33,700. The receipts of the society from other sources besides the income of permanent funds in 1827, were \$152 88. Here, then, is a fund of \$35,000, given for the purpose of propagating evangelical religion, that is henceforth, as fast as such an application of its income can be safely made, to be devoted to the propagation of Unitarianism.

Before this society, soon after it had commenced the course of perversion above described, was preached the sermon now before us. It is assumed by the author, on the authority of the text (Mic. iv. 1—4.) and numerous other predictions, that the time will come, "when genuine Christianity, with its blessed influences on the temporal condition and the eternal prospects of men, shall be diffused among all nations." In accomplishing this glorious revolution, "the efficient agency will be that of the Holy Spirit;" but means must be used, and men must be employed in dispensing them. How, then, shall this instrumentality be directed?

"Shall our primary object be to civilize or to christianize the heathen? And when we come to teach them the doctrines of religion,—whether at the commencement of our efforts for their improvement, or at a subsequent period,—shall we inculcate only the simpler and more general principles of our faith? or shall we, at once, present and urge upon their acceptance its most sublime and distinctive truths?"

In answer to these questions, the author shows conclusively, from the directions of Christ, the example of the apostles, and from well authenticated facts—in opposition to the opinions of some, who would be wiser than the primitive preachers of the Gospel—that the heathen nations must first be christianized,—and that, in imparting to them Christianity, we must "at once present, and

urge upon their acceptance, its most sublime and distinctive truths, such as "the incarnation of the Son of God, the propitiation made in his blood for the sins of the world, the lost condition of unrenewed men, the necessity of their renovation by the Holy Spirit, and the endless happiness or misery depending on the character formed in the present life." The facts by which this latter position is sustained are exceedingly interesting, as well as convincing. The following is an account of the conversion of a North American Indian, under the instruction of a Moravian missionary.

"When the missionary came to his tribe 'he was,' says the history, 'the greatest drunkard in the whole town; he was quite outrageous in sin, and had even rendered himself a cripple by his debaucheries.' But soon he was remarkably and permanently changed. 'The drunkard had learned to be sober; and the man, who was as savage as a bear, had become mild and peaceful as a lamb. He afterwards gave the Brethren the following simple and instructive 'account of his conversion.' 'I,' said he, 'have been a heathen, and have grown old among the heathen; therefore I know how the heathen think. Once a preacher came, and began to tell us that there was a God. We answered him, saying, 'Dost thou think us so ignorant as not to know that? Go back to the place from whence thou camest?' Then another preacher came to us, and began to say, 'You must not steal, nor lie, nor get drunk.' To him we answered, 'Thou fool; dost thou think that we do not know that? Learn first thyself, and then teach thy own people to leave off these practices; for who steal, or lie, or are more drunken than the white men.' Thus we dismissed him. After some time brother Rauch* came into my hut, and sat down by me. He then spoke to me as follows: 'I am come to you in the name of the Lord of heaven and earth. He sends to let you know that he will make you happy, and deliver you from the misery in which you at present lie. For this purpose he became a man, gave his life a ransom, and shed his blood for you.' When he had finished his discourse, he lay down upon a board, fatigued by his journey, and fell into a sound sleep. I then thought, 'What kind of a man is this? There he sleeps. I might kill him, and throw him into the wood, and who would regard it? But this gives him no care or concern.' At the same time, I could not forget his words. They constantly recurred to my mind. Even when I slept, I dreamed of that blood which Christ shed for us. I found this to be something different from what I ever heard before; and I interpreted brother Rauch's words to the other Indians. Thus, through the grace of God, an awakening began among us. *Brethren, preach Christ our Saviour, and his sufferings and death, if you would have your words to gain entrance among the heathen.*"†

ERRATA.

In our last number, p. 642, sixth line from the bottom, it is represented that Chubb "became a *confessed* infidel." The word "*confessed*" should be omitted.

Page 645, twelfth line from the bottom, for "*impossibility*," read *possibility*.

* Christian Henry Rauch, the Moravian missionary who had been instrumental in his conversion.

† Brown's History of Missions, vol. i. pp. 396, 397.

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

FEBRUARY, 1830.

NO. 2.

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE DECLINE, REVIVAL, AND PRESENT STATE OF EVANGELICAL RELIGION IN GERMANY.*

THE attention of the Christian public has, of late, been called particularly and repeatedly to the great and interesting changes, which religion and religious sentiments have undergone, within from about sixty to eighty years, in that part of Europe of which I am at this time to speak. We have had the appalling sight of a Christian country deluged with infidelity, and all its concomitants of licentiousness and vice. We have witnessed a few noble spirits, a few names written, as we trust, in heaven, engaged in a contest, long and fierce, against a host of enemies—enemies as powerful and malicious, as subtle, decided and persevering as have ever been arrayed against the cause of truth. We have heard the shout of victory raised by the enemy, echoing from one end of the land to the other, proclaiming the supposed extermination of the true religion of Christ. We have seen the believers in Jesus, as a body, overwhelmed, and prostrated with their faces to the dust, bearing their iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers, ‘and drinking at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury’ to the very dregs. We have heard their haughty enemies say, ‘Bow down, that we may go over;’ ‘and they laid their bodies as the ground and as the street to them that went over.’ ‘Rase it, rase it,’ was the universal shout of the adversaries in that gloomy time, when God drew back his hand, and hid his face from his people; when he made them to pass through the furnace of fire, ‘to purge away their dross, and to take away their tin.’ But withal, we have seen the wrath of man to praise

* The writer of the following article, as will be inferred from the statements and mode of expression, is a German. The account which he gives will be new and interesting to our readers, and, it is presumed, may be relied on as correct.

God, and the remainder thereof restrained. Zion is awaking again, shaking herself from the dust, and, putting on her strength, meets in open contest, and with brightening hopes of victory, her profane enemy, who had so proudly and so long 'defied the armies of the living God.'

It is proposed to divide the subject into three parts. First—*The declining state of religion in Germany during the latter half of the last century.* Secondly—*Its revival and growth, from about 1804 to 1824.* And thirdly—*Its present state.*

1. The declining state of religion in Germany.

If we go back into the first half of the eighteenth century, and examine the state of the Protestant churches in Germany, and the spirit of the religious publications of the day, we shall find much sound and deep practical piety in the community, and a very animating spirit of devotedness, connected with purity of doctrine, in the religious works then published. The writings of Arndt, Spener, Franke, Tersteegen, Gerhard, and many others, were admirably calculated to excite and cherish true and undefiled religion in the churches. They exhibited divine truth with a simplicity, faithfulness and power, worthy of the apostolic age. But in the second half of the century, the religious publications underwent generally a rapid and lamentable change. A most surprising barrenness characterizes most even of the better works published from 1760 and downward. The more they increased in number, and rose in character, as compositions, the less they seemed to contain to lead the sinner to Christ, or to animate and benefit the believer. Sermons, hymn-books, prayer-books, and other works for public and private use, as clear as water, and as precise as any proposition in geometry, as cold also as the one, and as unproductive of religious feeling as the other, were daily pouring in upon the public, to supplant those precious guides to heaven which had so long been instrumental in building up the church of Christ. Particularly striking is the unequalled *deceitfulness* of many of these publications. In various instances, it was not only difficult, but absolutely impossible fairly to unmask the author, and to convict him of unchristian sentiments, so well he knew how to hide himself under a show of piety and orthodoxy. And yet, the certain effect of these books was to divest a man, before he was aware of it, of all belief in the Bible as a revelation from God, and in Christ as a divine person, and the Redeemer of lost men.

Whoever is acquainted with the state of German theology at that time, will easily account for these facts. The theological skepticism of Semler and his companions had captivated the greater part of the ministry. Doubts or secret unbelief as to a positive divine revelation, possessed their hearts, controlled their reason, and guided their pens. The skepticism of some of the

English philosophers and rationalists, and the infidelity of the French philosophers, could not remain without effect. They had read Shaftesbury, Tindal, Morgan, Chubb and Hume; Whitby, Taylor, and Clarke; Voltaire, the Encyclopédists, and the author of the *System of Nature* (*Système de la Nature*). And if the German philosophy counteracted, in any measure, the influence of these men, and saved the ministry from universal skepticism and atheism, it stripped the weaker, i. e. the greater part, of what belief they yet had in any of the strictly revealed truths. To the courts of Germany, it is well known an example of infidelity was set, by Joseph II., the Roman emperor, and Frederic I., king of Prussia—men, whose influence was the more powerful, as they united some excellencies of character, as men and as monarchs, with an utter neglect, if not contempt of religion. Through the lower and middle classes of society, especially about the Rhine, irreligion and vice was effectually spread by the French emigrants at the close of the century. Nor were injurious examples wanting among some men of learning and reputed piety. Gellert, the father of modern German poetry, whose religious hymns are yet used and admired, once tried himself in novel-writing, and composed a number of very tedious plays for the moral improvement of the German stage. He wanted “to make the devil pious,” as Luther says, but did not succeed. We will charitably suppose that he did not know what he was doing.

The consequences of all this might easily have been predicted. Through the influence of unrestrained depravity, the morals of society rapidly declined. The religious state of the communities grew worse from year to year; and the preaching heard from most of the orthodox pulpits was far enough from being able to counteract the spirit of the times. Gospel truth was, indeed, proclaimed by many as yet; but not constantly, not the whole, not in its fulness, not with close and fearless application. Christian morals, the favorite subject, was preached by some of the best men to a disproportionate and sometimes an almost disgusting degree. Take, for instance, Zollikofer, the great Coryphæus of pulpit eloquence among the reformed churches in Germany. In all his published sermons, I have not seen one on any of the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. In 1783, he published two volumes of sermons “On the Dignity of Man,” when there was much more reason to publish as many ‘On the Depravity of Man.’ This dignity, according to the first sermon, consists in reason, liberty, activity, growth of perfection, immortality, his relation to God, &c. This relation is the image of God which man possesses. (Not a word about his having lost it.) This image of God is the ground of man’s relation to Christ, as his friend, brother, relative, as making man a member of Christ’s body, of one mind with him, &c. I

will give a few more of the subjects of his sermons, in the first volume of that work. The first was "On the Dignity of Man, and wherein it consisted." II. "What is opposed to that Dignity." III. "How does the Christian Religion restore the Dignity of Man?" This seems to imply that his dignity was lost; but no: for it restores it, 1. By throwing light upon our relation to God; 2. It teaches us what an interest God takes in the welfare of man, what he did for him, and what he still does. Here the coming of Christ is just touched upon, in three or four lines, whilst the dealings of God with the patriarchs, the people of Israel, &c., is largely exhibited. 3. It throws light upon the providence and government of God. 4. It makes the dignity of man conspicuous in the person of Christ, and in his conduct and destiny, as the head and restorer of our race. 5. It teaches the great doctrines of immortality and eternal life. This is the manner in which the Christian religion restores the dignity of man. Can a more 'uncertain sound' be given? Then follow sermons on the following subjects: On the value of life; of health; of riches; of honor; of the pleasures of sense; of spiritual enjoyment; of devotion; of sensibility; of virtue, &c. In the confession of faith, proposed to a young prince at his confirmation, not one of those doctrines is mentioned, which distinguish the Christian religion from Rationalism, Unitarianism, or any other Monotheism.

Much better is Francis V. Reinhardt, one of the best preachers Germany ever had. He entered upon his theological career as an acute thinker, and a skeptical inquirer; but came out a believing, pious theologian and Christian. He touches frequently upon the doctrines of the Gospel, even at the earlier period of his life; and whenever he does so, he is unequivocally orthodox. But he never gave these doctrines that prominence which they deserve, until perhaps from the year 1810, when his mind became fully satisfied with regard to them. He was, however, too much of a moralist. His sermons are exceedingly interesting and improving to the Christian; and if he had lived in the millenium, when the devil will be bound, and cast into the bottomless pit, and shut up to deceive the nations no more, his preaching would have been well adapted to his audience, and to the state of things. But when it was emphatically the hour of the enemy, and the power of darkness; when the very gates of hell seemed to be open, to let loose upon half Europe all which was subtle, malicious and ruinous; then was a clearer sound needed, to rouse the slumbering or disheartened disciples of Christ, and to rally them around the standard of the cross. I might proceed to characterize Spalding, and some other preachers of that age, but my limits will not permit. They all labor, in a greater or less degree, under the same difficulty. Their sermons are little more than moral essays,

addressed to men as though they were almost, if not altogether, in a safe condition. The character of an unconverted audience, and the peculiar and important office of the law in the conversion of the sinner, were not understood.

Thus, whilst religion had but a few, and those timid defenders, Rationalism, as may be supposed, had bold and daring advocates in abundance. The higher literary characters promulgated the new doctrines as professors and authors; while men of less weight and learning inculcated them in the pulpit, each in his own way, mixed up with as much orthodoxy, or clothed in as orthodox a phraseology, as the supposed prejudice of his congregation would require. In many places, persons of this description occupied the whole ground; whilst in others, they had the dissatisfaction of seeing the progress of their pretended reformation checked, by the orthodox preaching of some superstitious mystics, as they termed them. By the governments, Rationalism was rather fostered than opposed, and the universities soon came out boldly on its side. Periodicals either took no notice of religion, or were decidedly opposed to it, and especially to every appearance of a revival, which they deemed the height of folly and fanaticism. The reading part of the community were diverted from the subject of religion by the impulse which every science and art was receiving at that time, and especially by those sweeping revolutions in the departments of metaphysics and philosophy. And whosoever felt a desire after something better than mere speculation, usually took up with that sentimental religion (if it deserves the name) of which De Wette was the advocate—a sickly, sterile, undefinable abortion of metaphysics, unproductive of anything good or holy in life or emotion, but doubtless the only refuge of those who find no rest in philosophy, and seek none in revelation.

Religion, then, in the proper sense of the word, soon became almost entirely unknown. The Bible was neglected in families. To young persons of education or polished manners, it would have been a disgrace so much as to own one. Public worship was deserted; the sabbath was profaned by every kind of business, the opening of theatres, ball-rooms, &c.; and vice and licentiousness increased to a most alarming degree.

Still God had some faithful witnesses in Germany, even at that period of infidelity. The names of those theologians and critics who have distinguished themselves in the defence of truth are too well known to be mentioned here. In the lower classes of society there were humble disciples of Christ, some praying and weeping in secret places over the desolations which they witnessed, and some enjoying communion with their Saviour, in a happy ignorance of what was transacting upon the literary and theological stage of Germany. Switzerland, Würtemberg, some parts of

Prussia, and all the places to which Moravian influence extended itself, were never wholly in possession of the pretended reformers. A happy influence was exerted by another sect, called Pietists, who resided principally in the kingdom of Würtemberg. A small number of literary men of the first character seemed destined also to make a narrow escape. As they are not generally known in America, it may be gratifying to hear the names of some of them, accompanied with a few brief remarks respecting their characters.

Albert von Haller, the author of the immortal but unfinished poem '*On Eternity*,' was one of this number. "It was in the defence of religion and revelation," says a biographer of his, who was himself a professed unbeliever, "that Haller spent the last powers of his mind. From his youth up, he cherished a deep reverence for religion, and the study of the New Testament had ever been a regular business with him. In his life and in his writings, he proved a zealous friend and an able defender of revealed truth." In his old age, he was troubled with doubts respecting his state. "Anxiously concerned about his soul," continues the same biographer, "and bowed down under a sense of his guilt, it was at last only in prayer that he could find that strength and consolation which he so much needed." The Roman emperor, Joseph II., on his return from France, took a circuitous route for the single purpose of seeing Haller. Finding him surrounded with books and manuscripts, the emperor asked him whether the labor did not fatigue him, and whether he continued to make poems? "This was one of the sins of my youth," replied Haller; "only a Voltaire can make verses in his eightieth year." Soon after the emperor's visit, a neighboring clergyman called to congratulate him on the honor which he had received. The old man simply replied, "Rejoice if your names are written in heaven." In his diary he wrote, "Something flattering has happened to my vanity and pride, but let me, O God, not forget, that my happiness does not depend on man, from whose favor or displeasure I shall, a few moments hence, have nothing more to hope or to fear. Let me remember, that the only true happiness is to know thee, to have secured *thy* grace, and to have in thee a reconciled God and Judge." In December, 1777, he wrote in his diary, "This is probably the last time that I shall use a pen. I cannot conceal it, that the view of the approaching Judge is awful to me. How shall I stand before Him, since I am not so prepared for eternity as I think every Christian ought to be. O my Saviour, be thou my Intercessor and Redeemer in this fearful hour. Give me the assistance of thy Spirit, to guide me through the awful valley of death, and when I die, may I, like thee, exclaim, triumphantly and full of

faith, 'It is finished: Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit.'" He died in a calm state of mind, December 12, 1777.

John G. Hamann, (born August 27, 1730, at Königsburg in Prussia,) a man whose superior talents and extensive information, as well as something mysterious in his character and life, have made him of late an object of the deepest interest in Germany, is another instance. During his life, he and his works remained unknown. It was not until after his death, and at the repeated appeals of Herder, Jean Paul, and Jacobi to the public, that his writings attracted notice. They were sought for, but in vain; they had disappeared, and a new edition is yet to revive them. He deeply lamented the miserable condition of his generation. "O," he exclaimed, "what a *negative* age is this! What hosts of *negative* men! All are bent upon taking away, none will give; all seek to destroy, none will build up. There is no seriousness in them, it is all levity; no dignity, it is all railing; no frankness, it is all deception."

Matthias Claudius, (born 1740, at Rheinfeld,) shines like the morning star among the small number of literary men who escaped the contagion of the day. He lived, at first, as a private man at Wansbeck, near Hamburg. Afterwards he enjoyed the small income of an office, at the Bank of Holstein at Altona. His literary acquisitions commanded the respect of his enemies; whilst his decided Christian character, and his sound views of the Gospel, exasperated them to a very high degree. At first, his communications appeared in several periodical works, especially in the *Messenger of Wansbeck* (*Der Wansbecker Bote*). Afterwards he collected them, and, with a few additions, published them in four volumes.* They are of a very peculiar kind, but perfectly adapted to the character of a postman, or letter-carrier, which he assumed in the work, although easily misunderstood by readers not acquainted with existing circumstances. He is often humorous, but his humor is never offensive, or inconsistent with the faith or character of a Christian. He exhibits, everywhere, a soundness of religious sentiment, a purity of doctrinal views, and a depth of Christian experience, equally surprising and animating. "After the Bible," says Tholuck, "I love Claudius better than any other book." He died in 1815, at the advanced age of seventy-five.

The famous Count von Stollberg was a most interesting character. He was a man of a sound and a powerful mind, of superior acquisitions, and of decided and ardent piety. We should be unable to account for his transition from the Protestant to the Roman Catholic church, had he not lived in an age when the most provoking unfairness in religious controversy, and a

* With the title, "The Works of the Messenger, or Postman, of Wansbeck."

settled hatred to vital piety, prevailing almost throughout Germany, seemed to extinguish the hope of ever seeing religion revive in either of the two Protestant denominations. With good people in the lower classes of society, he probably never came in contact. He was ever ready to bear his testimony in behalf of truth, and deeply lamented the miserable state of things. In one of his letters (1788,) he says, "In a certain sublime sense it may be said, that truth needs no defence. But her objective invincibility is a poor consolation for the philanthropist, and especially for a *father*, who has reason to fear the approach of times when his children shall have to dwell among baptized, and perhaps even among unbaptized heathen. That new-fashioned, half-Christianity, which makes the Son of God only the greatest and best of God's messengers, cannot stand, since the Bible opposes it on every side. Nor can Naturalism endure, that monster of a system, borne up by vapors which every wind may dissipate, and every sunbeam dissolve. But still, decided pyrrhonism (skepticism) and practical atheism on the one hand, and blind superstition on the other, may dwell so close together as to leave no room for religion, and so drive her out again into the desert. However, there is yet one hope left to us. The time may come when true Christians shall unite themselves; when the fatal consequences of infidelity will become conspicuous; and men, chased from error to error, and from doubt to despair, will return to the simple, heavenly wisdom of the Bible." In 1790, he wrote to the well known Jacobi to furnish him with an instructor for his children. "When you write to your brother, or sister," says he, "tell them that I will have no Neologian, though he be as learned as Aristotle, and as wise and virtuous as Xenophon. On this subject I am intolerant. I do not care whether he has studied theology or law; whether he is a Lutheran or a Calvinist: *but he must be a true believer in the Gospel. I would rather have an honest Atheist, if there be any, than such an empty talker, made up of belief and unbelief*, as most of our theologians now are."

I shall mention but another individual, Henry Jacobi, who has acted such a conspicuous part in the philosophical revolutions in Germany, and who has brought philosophy and religion nearer together than any other metaphysician of his time. Whether he was a true Christian until near the close of life, there is reason to doubt; but he is an interesting character to the Christian observer, a man of high sensibilities, and an anxious, persevering inquirer after truth. He felt the need of something better than what the spirit of his age could give him. He knew it was in the Bible, and in the Bible only, but how to find it there he did not know. He labored under the common difficulty of philosophical inquirers; religion was too nigh unto him, in his mouth, and in his heart, while he sought it with the telescope through the boundless

space of the universe. In the year 1817, he wrote to one of his friends, who entertained similar views and feelings with himself, as follows: "With your complaints about the unsatisfactory nature of all our speculations I most heartily, though sorrowfully agree. I know, however, no other counsel than to speculate and philosophize right on. There is a singular religious commotion throughout Europe, especially in Germany. I hear much respecting it from travellers who visit me, but can never ascertain anything definite. Very lately I received a call of the two sons of Bishop Sack in Berlin. They are excellent young men. They hold fast the word of God, and the younger is specially zealous for it. With him I entered into conversation on the subject as earnestly and deeply as I could, in order to ascertain how to get that religion which he possessed: For the requisite directions I thought he must, at any rate, be able to give. He saw that I was sincere, that I concealed nothing from him, and that no presumption, or pride, or vanity, would prevent me from exchanging cheerfully my frail, speculative religion, for one positive and founded on historical facts, as his was. He saw it, and could not conceive why I did not do so. At last he saw no other alternative than to retire into the fortification of his individual experience and feelings, and to shut the door against me." In another letter, written the same year, he says, "*My mind now stands thus: I am fully satisfied that he who wants the piety of the fathers, must want their belief also. But how I am to want that sound, solid, plain piety in such a manner as really to obtain it, I do not know.*" In another place in the same letter, he says, "*There must be something higher and nobler, and capable of being apprehended and possessed by men, and communicated to others, or it is not worth while that a theologian or a philosopher should open his mouth and talk.* I hear inquiries made, on every side, after this something; but I hear no satisfactory answer given to them." Towards the close he says, "You see, my dear, that I am still the same; a thorough heathen in my understanding, but with my whole heart a Christian. I am swimming between two oceans of heterogeneous elements. They will not unite to support me in common. As the one raises me up, so the other always carries me down again into the deep." Before his dying hour approached, Jacobi prayed; and he humbly blessed God for that grace which permitted him to pray; and declaring grace to be his refuge and his hope, he departed. May he not be wanting in the realms of peace and glory!

I cannot conclude this part of the subject without adding, what indeed might be presumed, that in several instances a powerful voice was raised against Neologism by the very enemies of orthodoxy. The glaring inconsistency of that system would not remain unnoticed by irreligious men of a sound mind. The following re-

marks of Lessing, who has written one of the most outrageous books against religion, will be found interesting. They are mostly taken from his letters, although I owe them to another source. Speaking of the old and new system of theology, he expresses himself thus, "I am not at all of the opinion that the unclean water, which has long since been good for nothing, should be preserved; but I would not have it poured away, until we know where to take clean water. I would not have it heedlessly poured out, I say, and then be obliged to bathe the child in dung water. For what is the new theology, else than dung water, when compared with the unclean water of the Orthodox system! I agree with you, that the old system is false; but I am not yet ready to admit that it is a patch work of half philosophers and buncklers. There is not a thing in the world against which sagacity has tried herself so well, as against this system. The new fashioned system is such a patch-work." Again, "There was a wall of separation fixed between religion and philosophy, behind which every one could comfortably go along without incommoding the rest. But what do they now? They tear down this wall; and under the pretence of making us reasonable Christians, they make us most unreasonable philosophers." Again, "Reason must decide, in the first place, whether a book is a revelation, or not; but when this question is answered in the affirmative, and she finds things in her revelation which she cannot explain, this must rather be an argument in its favor, than against it. Verily, the man is yet to appear, who shall attack religion on the one side. and he who shall defend it on the other, in that manner which the importance of the subject requires,—with all the knowledge, all the love for truth, and all the seriousness it demands." In another place he says, "The speculative theologian may indeed be startled by an objector; but may the Christian? No, not he. The former may be perplexed, when the props on which his system rested are struck away. But what has the Christian to do with the hypotheses, proofs, and explanations of this man? If religion exists for nobody else, it exists at least for him;—he feels it so truly and deeply, and it renders him so happy. When the paralytic experiences the beneficial effect of the electric spark; what does he care, whether Nollet is right, or Franklin, or neither of the two? The Christian is the bold conqueror, who leaves the frontier fortresses behind him, and takes possession of the country: the speculative theologian is the timid hireling, who dashes his head against their walls, and never sees the land. If Christ is not '*the true God*,' then the Mohammedan religion is unquestionably an improvement upon the Christian, and Mohammed was a much greater and worthier man than Christ; more faithful, more cautious, and more zealous for the glory of the one God. For supposing that Christ never pretended to be God, still he uttered a hundred equivocal sentiments to lead the simple

into that error : whereas Mohammed was never guilty of such ambiguities." Only one quotation more : " Man is made for action, and not for empty speculation. But on that very account, he is fond of the latter, and neglects the former. His wickedness will always prompt him to do what he ought not to do, and his daring lead him to that which he cannot. Infatuated mortals ! That which is above your comprehension may exist, but *not for you*. Turn your looks within yourselves ; within *you* are those unfathomable mines, in which you may lose yourselves with profit. Here learn the weakness and the strength, the secret windings, and the bold outbursts of your passions. Here organize that empire, in which you shall be at the same time both subject and king."

These were the feelings of an avowed enemy to religion. Here and there a pious man, or one of a sound, consistent mind would also raise his voice ; but they were all drowned. The state of things became worse every year, until 1804,—where I presume, is the turning point of light and darkness, and where our *second* inquiry begins.

Early in 1804, a correspondence was opened between the British and Foreign Bible Society, and certain influential and pious citizens of Nuremberg, in the circle of Franconia, in which correspondence one hundred pounds were offered by the former, if a similar institution should be established in that place. This was the first offer which the British and Foreign Bible Society ever made to a foreign society. The condition was met, May 10th, 1804. On Ascension, a number of Christians assembled, and unanimously resolved to unite for the formation of a Bible Society. At the same time it was voted, that an address should be published to their Christian friends throughout Germany and Switzerland, to rouse them up to an active cooperation in the work. In 1806, this Society was transferred to Basle, as a more eligible place for its operations, and it has now the name of the Basle Bible Society. Its operations, though embarrassed at first, became more vigorous every year. In 1813, it distributed 1299 Bibles ; in 1814, 2583 Bibles ; in 1815, 5055 Bibles, and 3796 Testaments ; in 1816, 7920 Bibles, and 9383 Testaments. On the 18th of June, 1817, the 11th edition of the German Bible in 8vo. issued from the press ; and on the 18th of July, not one copy was left. On the 19th of August, the 12th edition appeared, and was disposed of in eleven days.

In the same year (1804) the British and Foreign Bible Society addressed letters of inquiry to Berlin. Early in 1806, a Bible Society was formed there, under the patronage of noblemen and other gentlemen of distinction, and received the approbation of the king. In 1814, it was united with the great Prussian Bible Society organized by Mr. Pinkerton, which embraced the whole kingdom. Time would fail me to speak of all the Bible Societies

which were formed in rapid succession, from the year 1812 and downward, by the pious efforts of Mr. Pinkerton and Mr. Steinkopf, both agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Before the close of 1814, were organized, the Prussian Bible Society, already mentioned, the Würtemberg Bible Society, the Hanoverian Bible Society, the Dresden Bible Society, the Bible Societies of Cleves, Osnabrück, Kœnigsfeldt, Nassau-Homburg, Frankfort, New Wied and Wied-Runsel. There was also a Bible Society formed as early as 1806 by some pious Roman Catholics in Ratisbon, [Bavaria.] Thus the spiritual restoration of Germany commenced; and the first means which God chose to employ was HIS OWN WORD.

The dissemination of the word of God was soon followed by the calamities of war, which had the effect to lead many minds to serious reflection. It was doubtless during those seasons of public distress, when neither property nor life was in any way secure, when a thousand worldly hopes and prospects were blasted, when sword and fire pervaded the land, that many a careless sinner first thought on God, eternity and himself. The evident display of the presence and power of God in the great events of 1814—15, when the mightiest empire on the continent was crushed, produced a surprising effect, and spread an awe, a solemnity and a joy over delivered Germany, such as she had never before experienced. Many individuals, in all classes of society, date from that period their first religious impressions, and their hope in Christ.

During the march of the allied armies to France, there were very favorable appearances among the soldiers, particularly those of Prussia and Saxony. Many of them were found carrying their New Testaments or Bibles, and their prayer books, and hymn books with them in their knapsacks. They met together, without distinction of rank, for religious conversation, prayer and singing, whenever they had an opportunity. This was the more surprising, since the Prussian armies had been as much distinguished for impiety, as for shrewdness and bravery, ever since the time of Frederic II. The religious excitement, for which the minds of people had been gradually prepared by the circulation of the Bible, and the reports, appeals and addresses of the various Bible Societies, now spread rapidly over Germany. In the kingdom of Würtemberg, where Storr, Flatt and Süsskind resided and labored, it kindled up on every side. From a want, however, of experienced men to direct it, the cause was exceedingly injured by the superstitious and visionary views and hopes in which many good people, especially young Christians, indulged. The Würtembergians seem universally prone to fanciful notions. They are the boldest Millenarians probably on the globe. In the year 1801, a considerable number of pious people emigrated from Würtemberg to Palestine, expect

ing, like some of the Jews, the Lord's visible appearace there. They were influenced to do so by a book, published the year before by a very pious minister and useful man, whose labors had been greatly blessed, but who was unfortunately addicted to such speculations. In 1817, if I remember right, a still larger number of people set out from the same country, with a view to reside on Mount Caucasus until the Lord's appearing. On account of some persecutions which they experienced, they thought they were the woman spoken of in Revelations xii. 1., being clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet; and they considered this journey to Caucasus as the removal of that woman into the wilderness, to be nourished there a time, times, and a half time. Many of them have since been miserably destroyed, or carried away captive by the Tshirkassians and sold into Persia, of whom a few have been removed by the Russian government. The rest may, in the providence of God, become missionaries among the Tshirkassians and Persians: a purpose for which, I doubt not, they would be willing to be sold.

Another interesting period was the great jubilee of the Reformation, celebrated in Germany, and in other parts of Protestant Europe. It was on this occasion that the pious and fearless Harms, pastor at Kiel,* published a new edition of the celebrated Theses of Luther, with appropriate remarks. This was truly a seasonable effort. The attempt of some to bring it into contempt was vain; the time had gone by when such a thing could be done. Men of weight and influence awoke to the subject, so as to alarm the most sanguine Rationalists. From that time until 1824, Protestant Europe enjoyed more revivals than it ever did before. The stillness with which they proceeded, and the neglect with which they were regarded by the editors of public papers, made it impossible to get any definite information respecting them. The most that is known was obtained by private correspondence, or from travelling Christians, or in some other private way.

About this time there was a powerful commotion in the Roman Catholic parts of Bavaria. Several Roman Catholic clergymen were converted, and proclaimed the Gospel with a purity and boldness which alarmed the higher ecclesiastical authorities of the Roman Catholic church, and roused up a persecution against them. Several of these preachers were put into prison. Some of them, when released, left their country, drawing after them great numbers, and afterwards became Protestant preachers in Prussia and Würtemberg. In the German parts of Switzerland, similar events took place, though at a later period. A Roman Catholic preacher and pastor of a church,†

* See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. i. p. 25.

† Mr. Henhoefer.

(to relate but one instance,) was ejected from office by his bishop, on account of his alleged Lutheran preaching. He joined publicly the Protestant church, and printed an apology, written with much ability and good feeling, in which he stated the reasons of his change to the people of his late charge. Another Roman Catholic priest was now sent to supply his place among them. With him they were soon disgusted, and voted that he be requested to leave them. And since their beloved pastor was not to be obtained, they voted that a call should be given to another pious Protestant minister, and that they would, as a body, connect themselves with the Protestant church. Several instances of this kind might be adduced, but time will not permit. I cannot dismiss this part of the subject without remarking that these revivals, in most cases, labored under serious difficulties. They were generally conducted by men who had just been awakened themselves, and who, of course, were nearly destitute of experience. Extravagances, therefore, might be expected. Religion was so much unknown, and so new to those who experienced it, that they felt themselves transported, at once, into the Millennium. The difference between their feelings after indulging a hope, and those which they had before, and which they saw that the world around them still had, was so very great, that their expectations, as to what was yet to come, often rose extravagantly high. The growing opposition and persecution which they, in many instances, experienced, and the universal contempt which they had to bear, led numbers not only to pray for the immediate coming of the kingdom of God, but *to hope and look for it*, with more impatience than they ought to have done.

But I hasten to my third topic, on which I have but a few words to say. As to theological controversies in Germany, they are manifestly drawing near their close. The catastrophe will and must be, that the Rationalists give up the Bible, deny its inspiration, and virtually call Christ a deceiver. Reason, that is, *their* reason, is the test of religious truth. They professedly give up the hope of proving their tenets from the Scriptures. On comparing what Germany was fifteen years ago, with what it is now, there is much reason for gratitude and hope. It is like the day-break just before the rising sun. But the sun is not yet risen. Some Christians are to be found in almost every Protestant city or place, but generally they are few. The church has many and powerful enemies, and their activity and success would be alarming, were they not manifestly on the decline. I may be permitted to mention the name of one, who is not yet known in America, Dr. Dinter, formerly president of a seminary for the education of school-teachers at Dresden, and now a member of the consistory of Prussia, and also of that body which superintends and guides all the schools of that kingdom. This man is a

thorough, shrewd and active Rationalist. He is wholly devoted to the superintendence of schools, and to the publication of books to assist the school-teachers in their duties. In 1825, he published an edition of the New Testament, with notes and hints for school-teachers; and he is now printing the Old Testament, which was completed last year as far as Job. This Bible is intended *for school-teachers*, not, as he expressly says, *for schools*. His notes and hints are calculated, in the best possible manner, to make the school-teachers and their children Rationalists and unbelievers before they are aware of it. There is not a doctrine of revelation but what is expressed in form, admitted and defended in appearance, and denied and ridiculed by inference, or perhaps in some other place, in plain words. And yet, on account of the ability with which the work is composed, and the exertions which he makes, thirty thousand copies have been scattered rapidly over Germany, and are now in the hands of about as many school-teachers, exerting their poisonous influence over as many schools. Dinter is remarkable for his activity and disinterestedness, which renders his influence the more powerful. He lives unmarried, in order to give himself wholly to his work. Poor himself, he educates in his house, at his own expense, a number of indigent boys, with whom he reads the Latin and Greek classics. Besides his many and pressing duties, he knits stockings for himself and other poor people; for he cannot be a moment without doing something. From the income of his publications, he devotes yearly about four hundred and twenty six dollars to the education of poor children, and to other benevolent purposes. Hence, if his piety is called in question, he proudly answers, "Let my office, my house, and my life prove my piety." This man is a fearful enemy of the church.

There is one more alarming circumstance, which I cannot omit. Revivals of religion have comparatively ceased in Germany. Light is therefore spreading but slowly, and not as could be wished, or as was expected a few years ago. There is more prayer needed among Christians, more faith, more humility, and more separation from the world. Germany needs one shock more in order to be recovered, and it will very likely receive it within a few years. The church there is not to be overcome. The prayers of pious generations past will yet be heard, and will prevail. And the work which God began some twenty years ago, and has carried on till now in spite of all opposition, he will doubtless complete, to the joy of his people, and to his own glory.

To the Editor of the Christian Examiner and Theological Review.

(Continued from page 24.)

III. It appears from this controversy, that in his first attempt to show that the most approved Calvinistic writers taught the doctrine of infant damnation, the reviewer failed entirely.

1. The quotation from Calvin, "*Iterum quæro*," &c., so much relied on, does neither teach nor imply the actual damnation of infants. It is immaterial how Jeremy Taylor or others have understood the passage. We have the text and context, and both forbid the interpretation which teaches actual infant damnation. Admonished, however, by the various interpretations given of this passage by men of unquestioned learning and skill in the languages, differing from the reviewer, from me, and from one another, I must retract the opinion that the passage is a singularly plain one. It gives me pleasure, too, to be able to retract the insinuation, sincerely entertained at the time it was made, of sinister management in this transaction. The reviewer will accept my thanks, also, for setting me right with respect to the *point* of the argument to which Calvin is replying, which is, as he says, "Whether it was DECREED that Adam should perish by his defection." Uncommitted, therefore, by my own or any other interpretation, I have examined the text and context anew, and am convinced, and expect to convince the reviewer, that, whatever Calvin may have believed, and taught in other places, on the subject of infant damnation, he did not intend to teach it, and does not teach it, in this passage. In the first place, the question in debate had no reference to the *actual* damnation of any one, adults or infants. It was not whether Adam actually perished eternally; nor whether predestination shows itself in the actual damnation of all his posterity; nor whether "all men by the fault of one" are "eternally and forever cut off from salvation;" nor whether all mankind, by the fault of one, are given over to eternal damnation; nor whether *tot gentes unâ cum liberis eorum infantibus*, "so many nations, with their infant children"—are actually damned. Neither this, nor any of the preceding sentences, have any reference to actual, eternal punishment. The whole of this phraseology is employed to express, simply and only, the effect of the fall on Adam, and on his posterity, *in itself considered*, provided there had been no merciful interposition of a Mediator, and an atonement, and a renovating Spirit. It expresses what we understand to be the meaning of Eph. ii. 3. "And were by nature children of wrath," i. e. born depraved, and under a sentence of just condemnation to eternal death. It was from this text espe-

cially that Calvin, and those who followed him, borrowed both the sentiment and the language contained in the disputed passage. But as they certainly did not understand this text to teach the actual damnation of all men, so neither is the language to be supposed to teach it, which they employ to express the meaning of the text. This language seems to have been used technically, to express the condition into which the fall brought mankind—the sin of one man subjecting all men to sin and condemnation to eternal death—“wrapping them up in eternal death” which, *in respect to any capacity in the subject to deliver himself*, is “eternal death without remedy.” A similar phraseology is employed by most approved theological writers now, to express the same thing. Hopkins, describing the effect of the fall—an effect which he considers common to Adam and all his posterity—says, “They were condemned, and fell into a state of complete eternal ruin, being totally and forever undone and lost, without any help or hope.” Thus also Edwards describes the effect of the fall:—“All mankind do constantly, in all ages, without fail, run into that moral evil which is, in effect, their own utter and eternal perdition.” Do Hopkins and Edwards teach the actual damnation of all mankind? But they teach it in much stronger terms than Calvin teaches the damnation of “so many nations, with their infant children.” And yet, they only describe, as he did, the effect produced, *provided it be not averted*. But a passage from Calvin himself establishes the point, that by damnation he meant the condemnation which infants are under from their birth; and that by *absque remedio*, he meant to represent this condemnation as irremediable *in itself considered*. This passage is contained in his reply to the fourth objection of Servetus against infant baptism, which was, Because “that which is past is natural, we ought to wait the proper time for baptism, which is spiritual.” To which Calvin replies, “Ego autem, etsi fateor omnes posteros Adae, ex carne genitos, ab ipso utero gestare suam damnationem, id tamen obstare nego quominus statim remedium Deus afferat.”* “Now, though I grant that all the posterity of Adam, born of the flesh, *bring their damnation from the womb itself*, I deny that to hinder that God may not, nevertheless, *immediately bring a remedy*.” Here damnation means, not actual eternal damnation; for how, in that case, could God “immediately bring a remedy”? And to be without remedy means, not *eternal damnation without remedy*, but a condemnation *irremediable in itself*, and from which none but God could deliver.

It is in this sense that Turretin asserts that original sin is “sufficient for condemnation, on account of which we are born

* B. iv. Ch. xvi. Sec. 31.

children of wrath, and are said to die in Adam ;” and that infants, which “have been infected with original corruption only, are subjected to condemnation and death,”—that is, like all others, they are brought under the dominion of sin, and the sentence of a just condemnation.

It is in this sense only, as describing the effects of the fall on the entire race, adults included, and infants not excepted, that Calvin is to be understood in all the quotations first produced by the reviewer of my note. “We all, in the sight of God, are polluted”—“by nature children of wrath”—“accursed from the very womb” and so infants themselves “bring their damnation with them from their mothers’ womb.”

If, then, by *tot gentes*, particular nations were meant, and not all mankind ; the language no more teaches their actual eternal damnation, with their infant children, without remedy, than *omnes a salute exciderent unius parentis culpa*, teaches that all mankind are actually and forever cut off from salvation by the fault of one man ; and *cunctos mortales, in unius hominis persona, morti æternæ mancipatos fuisse*, means that all mankind were, in the person of one man, given over to actual eternal death. What reason can be given why these passages should be restricted to teach only the condition into which the fall brought the race, and “*involveret in æternæ morti*” be made to cut through all the laws of analogical interpretation, and teach the actual eternal damnation of so many nations, with their children ? What if “*iterum quero*” were the commencement of a new argument ? Has a new argument the power to abolish the analogical use of terms, by the same author, and in the same paragraph, and in the sentence next but one preceding ? But the pretence is both unsustained and contradicted, that “*iterum quero*” is the commencement of a new argument. This is not the phrase most commonly used to introduce a new subject or topic of argument, but that which is most naturally and commonly employed to enforce or illustrate a sentiment which has preceded. Besides, the argumentation in the paragraph is too compact and uninterrupted to admit of a new topic of argument at “*iterum quero*.” The question is, “Was it DECREED that Adam should perish by his defection ?” And the following is the order of ideas in the reply : ‘God works all things according to the counsel of his will. Man is his noblest work. Is it possible he should make him without any determinate end ? They (the Pelagians) maintain that God only decreed to treat him according to his desert. What then becomes of his omnipotence, by which he executes his secret counsels ? But predestination appears in the posterity of Adam. The loss of salvation by all, through the guilt of one, was not in the natural course of cause and effect, but by a divine constitution or decree, as my opponents reluctantly admit. Why

then should they deny the operation of a decree in respect to *one man*, who admit it in respect to all his posterity? He calls them absurd who object thus, overcoming great difficulties, and perplexing themselves with trifles; and after rallying them for their stupidity, he reiterates upon them the argument which their past dulness had failed to perceive.

Besides, he is reasoning from a *concession*—premises which his antagonists reluctantly admit, viz. that the posterity of Adam fell by a decree; and when he has pressed upon them “so many nations, with their infant children, involved in eternal death by a decree,” he thinks he has stopped their mouths. But this can be only upon the supposition that by “*tot gentes*” Calvin meant all mankind. For his antagonists, the Pelagians, did not admit that whole nations, with their infant children, are finally damned; and Calvin, if it be a new argument, had only asserted, but not proved it. If it is the conclusion, as no doubt it is, of his accumulating argument brought down upon them, it does indeed stop their mouths. But how an inference from premises which Calvin only asserted, and had not proved, and which his antagonists denied, could stop their mouths, does not seem so plain.

To conclude, if “*iterum quæro*” is the commencement of a new argument, what is this argument? An attempt to prove by the less, what he had already proved by the greater, viz. that Adam fell by a decree, from the fall of *some nations*, after he had proved it, by the concession of his opponents, from the effect of the fall on all mankind. Besides, as understood by the reviewer, there is no connexion of the premises with the conclusion. For what if so many nations, with their children, were sent to hell by a decree? how can a general conclusion be drawn from limited premises? It no more proves that Adam fell by a decree, than the swallowing up of so many parents, with their infant children, in Lisbon, by an earthquake, and in Herculaneum, by a volcanic eruption, proves that Adam fell by a decree.

Whether the reviewer and his friends will regard his witticism, and exultation over me, as being “*absque remedio*,” with as much satisfaction as they have done, it is not for me to predict. I am still, however, of opinion, that the inspired caution which I suggested, and the reviewer disregarded,—“Let not him that putteth on the harness boast as he that putteth it off”—was not superfluous advice, and, if observed, would have saved him and his friends from the mortification of premature boasting.

In respect to Turretin, the reviewer claims, 1. That he quotes, with approbation, some of the most offensive passages in Calvin’s writings, and says, “Had Dr. B. looked at the passages to which we referred him, he might have found among them ‘*iterum quæro*’” &c.

The reviewer will perceive that Dr. B. has looked at this most offensive passage, and shown that it does not teach that infants are damned.

2. The next evidence from Turretin, as at first quoted, is his interpretation of Romans v. 14. 'Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' By the persons here referred to, he understands infants; and by the death that reigned over them, eternal death; and therefore the reviewer *infers* that he taught, in the passage, actual infant damnation. But does he not know that death, *eternal death, reigning over men*, was a common phrase for expressing universal liability to punishment—the condition of guilt and condemnation into which the fall brought the race—and that it was applied to all adults, and to all infants, and could not have been meant to teach the actual damnation of those to whom it was applied, because, assuredly, Turretin did not hold that all adults and all infants were, through death, from Adam to Moses, actually sent to hell.

Not a particle of evidence, therefore, did the reviewer produce from Turretin in favor of infant damnation.

The passage at first quoted and relied on from Edwards to prove infant damnation, is as follows :

"But this to me appears plainly a *giving up* that grand point of the *imputation* of Adam's sin, both in whole and in part. For it supposes it to be not right for God to bring any *evil* on a child of Adam, which is innocent as to personal sin, without *paying for it*, or balancing it with *good*; so that still the state of the child shall be as *good* as could be demanded in *justice*, in case of mere *innocence*. Which plainly supposes that the child is not exposed to any proper *punishment* at all, or is not at all in *debt* to divine justice, on the account of Adam's sin." vol. vi. p. 462.

This passage the reviewer admits does not teach the doctrine expressly; but insists, that, in its connexion, it shows that he believed it. His argument is, that Edwards opposed some more tender-hearted Calvinists, who held to a partial imputation, and a mitigated punishment of infants, and therefore *he* must have held to a full imputation, and full punishment. But the fact is not so. Edwards does not oppose these more tender-hearted divines, in respect to the *actual condition* of infants, but objects to the arguments by which they opposed a full, and contended for a limited imputation.

1. Original sin, by a full imputation, is the subject of his controversy with Taylor; and his words are not needlessly to be carried beyond the exigence of his argument.

2. It is a full imputation, and complete liability to punishment on the part of infants, for which Edwards contends, and concerning which he says, that the opposite view "relieves nothing;"—i. e. if full imputation and full punishment be unjust, partial

imputation and mitigated punishment is unjust—the only difference being the degree of injustice. That infants are, on either supposition, actually punished, his argument does not require him to say, and he does not say.

But, says the reviewer, ‘that very circumstance proves that he believed it; for Watts was distressed on the subject, and Edwards had a fine opportunity to relieve him; and why did he not do it?’ Suppose we could not tell why? does it follow, therefore, that he believed in infant damnation? Perhaps he had not time, aside from his main argument, to speak as fully on so difficult a subject as he wished to do, if he spoke at all. Perhaps he had nothing to say, believing, with many others, that some infants certainly are saved, and concerning the rest, as he knew nothing, he said nothing, but left them in the hands of a merciful God. And possibly he may have chosen to write to Dr. Watts a private letter, saying that he agreed with his friend Dickinson, “that all those who die in infancy may, for aught we know, belong to the election of grace.” Such is the reviewer’s evidence that Edwards believed in infant damnation. He did not deny it, where his argument required no denial; therefore he believed that infants are damned.

To corroborate past deficiency, the reviewer gives the following quotation :

“It seems to me pretty manifest that none can, in good consistence with themselves, own a real *imputation* of the guilt of Adam’s first sin to his posterity, without owning that they are *justly* viewed and treated as *sinners*, truly guilty and *children of wrath* on that account : nor unless they allow a just imputation of the *whole of the evil* of that transgression: at least all that pertains to the essence of that act, as a full and complete violation of the *covenant* which God had established; even as much as if each one of mankind had the like covenant established with him singly, and had by the like direct and full act of rebellion, violated it for himself.” vol. vi. pp. 462, 463.

The only thing in this extract which even appears to teach anything but full desert, is the phrase, infants “are justly viewed and treated as sinners.” But Edwards is here speaking, not of their actual eternal doom; for he speaks of *all* infants, and *all men*, as affected by original sin. Did he believe then, and teach that all men are damned? Besides, the phrase, “viewed and treated,” has reference, in this passage, to their being viewed and treated as sinners in what happens to them in the present life, and not to their treatment in the future state.

The next corroboration in his second attempt is the following passage :

“We may well argue from these things, that infants are not looked upon by God as sinless, but that they are by nature children of wrath, seeing this terrible evil comes so heavily on mankind in infancy. But besides these things, which are observable concerning the mortality of infants in general, there are some particular cases of the *death of infants*, which the Scriptures set before us, that are attended with circumstances in a peculiar manner giving evidence of the sinfulness of such, and their just exposedness to divine wrath. As particularly,

"The destroying of the infants of Sodom, and the neighboring cities; which cities, destroyed in so extraordinary, miraculous and awful a manner, are set forth, as a signal example of God's dreadful vengeance for sin to the world in all generations; agreeable to that of the apostle Jude, verse 7. To say here, that God could make it up to those infants in another world, must be an insufficient reply. For so he could as easily have made it up to Lot, or to ten or fifty righteous, if they had been destroyed in the same fire: Nevertheless it is plainly signified, that this would not have been agreeable to the wise and holy proceedings of the Judge of all the earth." vol. vi. pp. 262, 453, 254.

But this passage teaches nothing to the purpose, except in the reference to Jude, verse 7; and that proves nothing, unless the reviewer means to admit that Jude teaches infant damnation. Besides, it is the temporal death of infants, of which, in this passage, Edwards is speaking, and not their eternal death; for the point of debate between him and Taylor was, not whether infants are *damned* in consequence of imputation and desert, but whether they are sinners by imputation, and deserving of punishment at all, of any kind or degree. And the *argument* he urges is, that temporal death is a punishment for sin—that therefore the death of infants proves *guilt*, which, as it cannot be actual, must be original by imputation; and the apostle Jude is quoted as giving an instance of the death of *children*, in which it is supposed to be inflicted as a punishment. But the text itself excepts infants from the vengeance of eternal fire; for it is said expressly that those who were set forth as an example of suffering, were those who "gave themselves to fornication, and went after strange flesh."

The objection, too, that God might make it up to infants, shows that the sufferings to be made up were the sufferings of temporal death; for how could God make up to them the sufferings of eternal death?

The following is the last passage adduced in the second attempt to sustain the charge that Edwards believed in the damnation of infants.

"Merely persons' being *born* in covenant, is no more evidence of their having moral sincerity, than saving grace. Yea, there is more reason to suppose the latter, than the former without it, in the infant children of believing parents. For the Scripture gives us ground to think, that some infants have the habit of saving grace, and that they have a new nature given them; but no reason at all to think, that ever God works any mere moral change in them, or infuses any habits of moral virtue, without saving grace: And we know they cannot come by moral habits in infancy, any other way than by immediate infusion: They cannot obtain them by human instruction, nor contract them by use and custom. And especially there is no reason to think that the children of such as are visible saints, according to Mr. Williams' scheme, have any goodness infused into them by God, of any kind. For in his scheme, all that are morally sincere may lawfully receive the privileges of visible saints; But we have no Scripture grounds to suppose that God will bless the children of such parents as have nothing more than moral sincerity, with either common or saving grace. There are no promises of the covenant of grace made to such parents, either concerning themselves or their children." vol. i. pp. 497, 498.

But here, the question at issue between Edwards and Williams is, not whether infants will be saved or lost, but what are the

requisite qualifications for communion in adults? Williams relied on moral sincerity and a blameless life, and on the actual membership and right to communion of all who had been baptized. Edwards undertakes to show him that his argument is a *felo de se*—that if moral sincerity is indispensable, there is no evidence that infants possess it—that “merely persons’ being born in covenant is no more evidence of moral sincerity than it is of saving grace”—nay, that there is more reason to suppose that infants have saving grace, than that they have moral sincerity; because we have some instances of sanctification from the womb, but none of moral sincerity being communicated without regeneration; and as they cannot obtain moral sincerity by instruction, and only by infusion, he concludes we have no reason to think, i. e. *have no evidence*, that God does communicate to the children of unrenewed men, either moral sincerity or holiness, as a qualification for subsequent sacramental communion.

Now then for the reviewer’s syllogism.

“1. Without God’s saving grace no one can be saved.

“2. Edwards says that the infants of mere morally sincere men cannot have saving grace. Therefore,

“3. Edwards believed that no such infants can be saved.”

But Edwards does not say they *cannot* have saving grace—he merely says that we have no *positive evidence* that it is communicated. And he says this only with reference to such as live, and not at all with reference to such as may die in infancy, for the state of such was no part of the subject in debate.

The following are quotations from Bellamy to prove infant damnation :—

No. 1. It is plain and evident, from *facts*, that Adam was considered and dealt with under the capacity of a public head, and that death *natural*, *spiritual*, and *eternal*, were included in the threatening; for all his posterity are evidently dealt with *just as if that had been the case*. They are born *spiritually dead*, as has been proved in the former discourse. They are evidently liable to *natural death*, as soon as they are born. And if they die and go into eternity with their native temper, they must necessarily be miserable in being what they are, unlike to God, and incapable of the enjoyment of him, and contrary to him. And God must necessarily look upon them with everlasting abhorrence. vol. i. p. 312.

No. 2. So that, to a demonstration, God’s thoughts of mercy towards a guilty, undone world, did not, in any measure, take its rise from any notion that mankind had been hardly dealt with, or that it would be anything like cruelty or unmercifulness to damn the whole world for Adam’s first sin. vol. i. p. 321.

No. 3. *Mankind were, by their fall, brought into a state of being infinitely worse than not to be*. The damned in hell, no doubt, are in such a state, else their punishment would not be infinite; as justice requires it should be. But mankind, by the fall, were brought into a state, for substance, as bad as that which the damned are in. For the damned undergo nothing in hell, but what, by the constitution with Adam, and the law of nature, all mankind were, and would have been, for substance, exposed unto, if mere grace had not prevented.” vol. i. p. 333.

To the objection, how can men have a heart to propagate their kind, if they are born children of wrath, in a state of being worse than not to be, Bellamy answers thus :—

No. 4. As to *godly* parents, they have such a spirit of love to God, and resignation to his will, and such an approbation of his dispensations towards mankind, and such a liking to his whole scheme of government, that they are content that God should govern the world as he does; and that he should have subjects to govern; and that themselves and their posterity should be under him, and at his disposal. Nor are they without hopes of mercy for their children, from sovereign grace through Christ, while they do, through him, devote and give them up to God, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. And thus they quiet themselves as to their souls. vol. i. p. 336.

No. 5. It was at God's sovereign election, to determine, whether to grant any relief, or not: and what relief to grant: and when, and to whom. To give his Son to die with a view to save all mankind, or only a part; to send the news of the Gospel to all nations, or only to some; to give every child of Adam, born in a Christian land, opportunity, by living, to hear the glad tidings, or only to grant this to some, while others die in infancy, and never hear. Those who die in infancy, may as justly be held under law in the next world, as those that live may in this. God is under no more obligations to save those that die, than he is to save those that live; to grant the regenerating influences of his Spirit to them than he is to these. vol. ii. pp. 369, 370.

No. 6. As to *carnal* men, since they are enemies to God and his holy law, it is no wonder they are at enmity against his whole scheme of conduct as Governor of the world. Did they understand how God governs the world, and firmly believe it, I doubt not it would make all their native enmity ferment to perfection. They would wish themselves to be from under God's government, and hate that he should ever have anything of their's to govern. As soon as ever they enter into the eternal world, and see how things really are, this will, no doubt, actually be their case. vol. i. p. 336.

The reviewer adduced, No. 2. chiefly "because it is so striking." What it strikes, or what he thought it struck, I cannot tell; as all it teaches is, that all mankind might have been punished justly for Adam's sin. But what has this to do to prove that infants are damned?

Nos. 1 and 3 were adduced to prove, "just what Dr. B. admits them to prove, and no more," viz. infant depravity, and, if they die in infancy, the necessity of renovation, to exempt them from misery, and prepare them for heaven.

It is from Nos. 4, 5, and 6, that the reviewer infers that Bellamy believed in the actual damnation of infants. He admits that Bellamy does not *say* that there is no hope for the children of unbelievers, dying in infancy, or that they are sent to hell; and it is his *not saying* that there is hope, in his circumstances, which brings to the reviewer's mind the "irresistible evidence," that it was his opinion that the infants of unbelievers are lost.

But suppose that Bellamy, like the Reformed, and moderate Calvinists, and Dickinson, (as the Scriptures had decided nothing,) could not tell what became of the infants of unbelievers, and could only answer the objection in respect to minds who have implicit confidence in God, and some revealed hope for their children; does it follow, because he did not answer an objection which he could not for want of information, that therefore, without information or evidence, he believed that infants are damned? The whole evidence, so irresistible to the mind of the reviewer, amounts to this, that Bellamy said nothing, where the greatest number of

Calvinists have said nothing ; because, knowing nothing, they had nothing to say.

In No. 5, Bellamy infers, as all who admitted imputation and desert, had done, the necessity of infant regeneration, and that if any die unconverted, and go into eternity alienated from God, they are under law, and may as justly be punished there for their sins, as if they had become actual transgressors in time. But he does not say that they cannot be regenerated without hearing the Gospel preached, nor does he say, or intimate a belief, that those who die in infancy are not sanctified. Still the reviewer urges silence, which, according to the predominant opinion of Calvinists, was the result of ignorance, as evidence of positive faith in infant damnation. The thought seems never to have entered his mind, that there is a difference, really a difference, between not knowing what becomes of the infants of unbelievers, and believing positively that they are damned. As if, because Socrates could not tell what became of the soul after death ; therefore he believed it to be annihilated. Is the reviewer never to be beaten off from a mode of reasoning, which he did not need to be told is nothing to the purpose, inferring from the concession, that because God is under no obligation to regenerate infants dying in infancy, more than to regenerate adults, therefore he certainly does not regenerate them ; that because election and reprobation *may* possibly have the same relation to children, as to adults, therefore they certainly do have the same, and some infants are in fact reprobated ! How long will it be, before the reviewer will believe himself, in saying and reiterating, that infant desert of punishment proves nothing to his purpose ?

The only remaining sentiment from Bellamy, which can seem to imply the actual perdition of infants is, that ‘ God’s enemies in the future state, when they see how things really are, would wish themselves to be from under his government, and hate that he should have *anything of theirs* to govern.’ ‘ *Anything of theirs,*’ the reviewer takes to mean their infant children in hell. But in so doing, he falsifies the author’s own most express meaning ; for he says, if they saw things as they are in the providence of God in this world, they would not be willing to have anything under his government, neither infant children nor adults.

Besides, in the future world, some children of unbelievers are doubtless in heaven, if not converted in infancy ; and, contrary to the reviewer’s supposition, the dissatisfaction of wicked men extends as really to God’s disposal of theirs in heaven, as in hell. Are not wicked men unwilling their children should come voluntarily under God’s government on earth, by becoming pious and joining the church ? It is the opinion of Calvinists that the same enmity will have the same effect in hell, as in time, and that the wicked will no more be pleased that their children are in

heaven than they now are that they join the church. This is the natural and necessary import of Bellamy's language. It has reference to the feelings of the wicked to God's entire government, and has no reference to actual infant damnation.

IV. It is a point settled by this discussion, that infant damnation is not a doctrine of the Calvinistic system.

That it is, the reviewer has attempted to prove,

1. By quotations from Calvinistic authors which teach infant depravity and desert of punishment.

2. By a reference to the doctrines of election and reprobation. To this I replied,

1. That infant desert no more proves infant damnation, than adult desert proves adult damnation.

2. That election and reprobation prove only that God has most mercifully determined to recover to holiness a part, and not the whole, of the human race ; but that this determines nothing as to the destiny of infants, it being as consistent with this general purpose to save a part, that infants should be included, as that they should be excluded : That the phrase, "elect infants," while it implies a belief that some are certainly saved, does not of necessity, and did not actually, in the estimation of approved authors, imply that some are certainly damned ; but only that the children of believers are saved, while concerning others, having no evidence, they formed no opinion, but left them in the hands of a merciful God. I then challenged the reviewer to name a single doctrine of the Calvinistic system from which the doctrine of infant damnation follows necessarily, and to point out coolly and clearly the connexion between the premises and the conclusion. To this the reviewer replies, that he did not need to be told that original sin proves only infant desert, and does not prove infant damnation ; that "it is the doctrine of *reprobation*, which, to the praise of Calvinistic justice, casts the little ones into hell," and that the quotations to prove infant depravity and desert were intended merely to show 'how naturally the doctrine of infant damnation results from original sin, and how it is connected with vital, essential doctrines of the system.'

Now really, when, in the opening of his attack upon my note, the reviewer proposed to "adduce his authorities for asserting that the doctrine of infant damnation is connected with essential, vital principles of the Calvinistic system," and brought out his array of quotations in proof of infant depravity and desert without one intimation that he knew they were nothing to the purpose, I really thought that by the connexion of infant damnation with essential vital principles of Calvinism, he meant the *logical* connexion, and that he quoted evidences of infant depravity and desert, as the premises, from which, as a conclusion, infant damnation followed necessarily. The thought never entered my mind that, by con-

nexion with vital principles, the reviewer meant only that original sin is "certainly a vital principle of Calvinism," and that infant damnation is certainly somehow connected with it"—not as proving it, but as a mere antecedent, inasmuch as if there had been no original sin, there could have been no infant damnation. As if the state's attorney should first convict a man, by positive testimony, of high-way robbery, and then, to corroborate the positive evidence, should prove that the criminal believed in the existence of high-ways, all for to show how naturally his crime followed from his faith, not indeed as a necessary consequence, but as an antecedent without which the consequence could not have existed.

We wonder the reviewer did not multiply quotations, to prove that Calvinists believe in the being of God, and in the creation of the heavens and the earth, and of Adam and Eve, as manifestly these also are vital doctrines, and it is alike manifest that infant damnation is connected with them; for if the world had not been made, or Adam and Eve had never been created, how could infants have been damned?

But the reviewer must certainly have forgotten his early purpose, in supposing that he did not set out to prove infant damnation by quotations which prove only infant depravity and desert, and is mistaken in supposing that he did not need to be told that they prove no such thing. For of Turretin who, as at first quoted, has testified only, as we have shown, to infant depravity and desert, he says, that "he did not hesitate to advance it," (the doctrine of infant damnation;) and of a quotation from Edwards, which taught only infant depravity and desert, he says, "it is directly and completely to our purpose." How could he call such a quotation "directly and completely to his purpose," if, at the time, he did not regard proof of infant desert, as equivalent to the proof of infant damnation? He must have thought so, for alluding to the same quotation, he says, that "the authority of Edwards is perhaps alone sufficient to decide the point at issue." But the point at issue is, whether the Calvinistic system includes, or most approved authors teach, the doctrine of *infant damnation*. How then could he think the authority of Edwards alone decisive, when his quotations taught only infant depravity and desert, had he not himself regarded infant damnation as a logical and inseparable conclusion from these premises?

"Bellamy (he says) certainly an approved writer, we mean to show, maintained the doctrine of infant damnation." But we have shown that the passages quoted from Bellamy teach only infant depravity and desert of punishment. And Boston's short testimony, "Surely we are not born innocent. These chains of wrath, which by nature are upon us, speak us to be born criminals. The swaddling bands, wherewith infants are bound hand and foot as soon as they are born, may put us in mind of the cords of wrath with which they

are held prisoners, as children of wrath," unquestionably teaches nothing but infant depravity and desert. But the testimony of Boston, the reviewer thinks "Dr. B. passed over in silence, probably because it was short, pointed, and to the purpose;" and he refers to him as one of the Sublapsarian divines who taught infant damnation. And having closed his array of quotations, most of which proved only original sin and liability to punishment, he says, "Such is Calvinism, which its ablest and most approved supporters have themselves expressly stated and enforced." And to show how and where he supposed them expressly to state the doctrine, he put the passages, sometimes in italics, and sometimes in capitals, just as he did those passages from Twiss and Gill, which really did teach the doctrine. But as most of the writers he had quoted *expressly* stated only infant depravity and desert, it is manifest that he did consider original sin, and desert of punishment, to be logical evidence of infant damnation. So I understood the reviewer, and so he understood himself, if his language or his arguments have any meaning.

And yet, notwithstanding all these undertakings and vauntings of success, no sooner did our arguments, exposing the fallacy of his reasoning from his premises, take him aback, than 'he never advanced the proof of infant depravity and desert of punishment to prove actual infant damnation!' "With a single exception, not one of the quotations of which Dr. B. has given the substance, was brought forward to prove more than he allows them to establish." And he "did not need to be told that original sin proves only desert of damnation, and does not teach that infants actually **are** damned," but "quoted them merely to show how naturally infant damnation results from, and is connected with, vital, essential principles of Calvinism."

But it is not, after all, his fixed opinion, that even these proofs are not express and conclusive. For when I challenged the reviewer to point out coolly and clearly the logical connexion between any doctrine of Calvinism and infant damnation, 'He does not think it best to labor much, in his own person, to point out that connexion,' but turns me over to the writers, most of whom, as I have shown, taught only infant depravity and desert, as having done the work thoroughly. That is, the authors, *en masse*, most of whom teach, as quoted, only infant depravity, are referred to as proving infant damnation. "What we have already said or cited," says the reviewer, "from the authorities just named, we **DID THINK**, and **THINK STILL**, was enough to set the point we meant to prove forever at rest." And yet the reviewer has condescended to tell us, that these passages on original sin do not teach infant damnation, but that "it is the doctrine of *reprobation*, which, to the praise of Calvinistic justice, casts the little ones into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels." But having now traced the monster to his den, to our demand, how he knows that

he is within, and what are his proofs, he does not think it best to labor much, in his own person, to answer that question, "when the task has been so thoroughly done by Calvin, and Turretin, and the Westminster Assembly, and Twiss, and Boston, and Gill, and Edwards, and Bellamy—all of whom he permitted to speak for themselves, and for him too." Now, we cannot but think that the reviewer does violence to his gentle nature. Why will he not condescend to tell *me* how infant damnation follows necessarily from predestination, having himself seen so long, and asserted so often, that connexion. It would take but a moment just to put his finger on it. It could be told in five lines. Why then send me back to authors? Does he think one so ignorant as he takes me to be, can work such a traverse? There is not a problem in all the sciences so difficult. In the first place, he quotes his authors, both singly and collectively, as teaching expressly infant damnation, who taught only infant depravity and desert. Secondly, he insists, that he knew from the beginning that they taught only depravity and desert, and did not quote them to prove infant damnation, and that they do not prove it. And yet, thirdly, he asserts that these very authors, calling them by name, one by one, have given me all needed light, and that he did think, when he cited them, and does think still, that their testimony is enough to settle the point at issue forever.

We ask whether it is possible for a man, who saw the connexion between reprobation and infant damnation, to shuffle and flounder in this manner; and whether the internal evidence is not conclusive, that he saw that there was no logical connexion, and had not magnanimity enough to retract a false accusation?

It was my opinion, at the time the reviewer replied to my note, that he *did confide*, unhesitatingly and chiefly, in his proofs of infant damnation from the quotations which prove infant depravity and desert. But my reply took away his armor in which he trusted, and then he endeavored to shift the question, by charging that artifice on me. He meant to retreat from his irrelevant proof-texts, and hang the whole evidence upon *reprobation*, by the same form of assertion, taking good care, by giving no explanation, and reiterating bold assertions, to keep out of the range of a return fire; while, to help his escape, he raised a great *smoke*, by multiplying quotations from ancient Calvinistic writers.

That he has left out, in his little volume purporting to contain the controversy, the whole of his first attack on me, to which I replied, and published only his strictures on my defence, seems inexplicable on the part of one so prone to triumph, if he did not himself consider my reply as fatal to his argument. Now, as the event would seem to indicate, and as charity itself would devoutly hope, the shock was so astounding that he has not perfectly

recovered himself from its bewildering effect, and affirms and denies, remembers and forgets, in the manner I have stated.

I have no pleasure in this exposure ; but it is doubtless as just that the community should see what sort of a controvertist I have to deal with, as what sort of one he has to deal with.

I have only to say again, that

"I deny unequivocally, that the Calvinistic system teaches or implies the doctrine that infants are damned; and I challenge the reviewer to *name* a single doctrine of the system from which it follows logically. I call upon him to state a doctrine of Calvinism which implies that infants are damned, and to point out, coolly and clearly, the connexion between the premises and the conclusion; and if he cannot do it, then I call upon him to make such amends, openly, for misrepresenting the doctrinal opinions of a large denomination of Christians, as public justice demands: as honor, magnimity, and conscience cannot fail to make."

Should he refuse to do this, then, before turning me over to those authors who have so satisfactorily done the work for him, but concerning whose testimony he is so settled and unsettled, so sure that they do, and so sure that they do not, teach infant damnation, I would only crave that he tell me, once for all, on which side of the contradiction lies his honest opinion—or whether he has no opinion, only as one is pushed out by exigence, sometimes on one side, and sometimes on the other.

(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS.

THE STAR IN THE WEST; *being Memoirs of the Life of Ridson Darracott, Minister of the Gospel at Wellington, Somerset; with Extracts from his Correspondence.* By JAMES BENNETT. First American Edition. Brookfield: E. and G. Merriam. 1829. pp. 216.

RIDSON DARRACOTT was born at Swanage, in the isle of Purbeck, on the coast of Dorsetshire, in February, 1717. His father was the dissenting minister of that retired place; but, as Mr. Bennett remarks,

"Neither the obscurity of the situation, nor the smallness of his charge, ever generated in his mind the lazy, arrogant conceit, that his callow thoughts were good enough for his audience. With great care he prepared, not only for the pulpit, where he might sometimes expect to address strangers attracted by his talents, but also for those private meetings of the members of his church, held after the Lord's supper, from which all strangers were excluded. The notes of the addresses he delivered on these occasions—when the pastor usually pours out the fulness of his heart without an attempt to shine—excite the highest ideas of his intellectual powers, and of the solicitude with which he studied, on every occasion, to promote the edification of his flock."

When the subject of these "Memoirs" was about five years old, his father removed to Chumleigh, in Devonshire. In this town, where young Ridson received the first rudiments of learning, under parental tuition, he afterwards consecrated to Christ the first labors of his ministry, as his father's successor.

"From school young Darracott went, at the age of about fifteen, to a dissenting college, to study for the ministry. The serious reader of his life will now naturally look for an account of the commencement of his religion. Of this, however, none but very slight and defective records remain. No doubt can be entertained of the divine blessing having so far accompanied the care of his pious father to train him up in the way in which he should go, that he never openly departed from it. His correct morals left him less reason than many have to lament the sins of his youth: and his early attention to the duties of religion rendered it impossible for others to mark the period of his conversion. But the best early cultivation and the most skilful pruning leave the nature of the tree unchanged. Nor did Darracott imagine that it is the privilege of such favored youths as himself to be exempted from the necessity of regeneration. He ever inculcated, with the zeal of conviction, and the skill of experience, the doctrine of the new birth."

Mr. Darracott was placed, at the age above mentioned, in the seminary at Northampton, over which the Rev. Dr. Doddridge presided—a man whose memory is dear to thousands of Christians in this country, and whose praise is in all our churches.

"While in the seminary, young Darracott lost his father, but found another in his tutor. The affectionate heart of the Doctor soon formed a strong attachment to the youth, in whom he perceived a soul panting for the noblest distinction. The frankness of his mind, the purity and strength of principle manifest in all his conduct, and the ardor of his devotion, so fixed the affections of Doddridge, as to induce him to say, 'I hope this young friend will be the guardian of my widow and orphans, should I be called away by death.'"

His intimate companions at this period were afterwards eminent among the faithful ministers of Christ. Fawcett, the successor of Baxter, Hervey, author of "Contemplations," and Pearsall, the pious pastor of the church at Taunton, were among his early and steadfast friends. In 1737, he received a license "to enter upon the office of preaching." He was then but twenty-one years old. He had previously attempted to preach in a village near Northampton, where the spirit of persecution (which formerly disgraced England, and even now occasionally bursts forth from the cold, formal pretenders to pharisaical righteousness,) gave him a specimen of the trials he must expect to encounter. The house, in which his auditory assembled, was attacked by a mob; but he was assisted by his hearers to escape unurt. He went from the seminary to Chumleigh, to preach to the church of which his father had been the pastor, and which was then destitute.

"Standing over his father's ashes, and leading the devotions of that church with which he had first learned to join in the worship of God, he labored with much approbation, and not without some effect. But as the congregation was divided in its choice between him and another young minister, he determined to relinquish the advantages he possessed, and retiring, sought another field of usefulness. In this he affords a salutary lesson to those who are entering on the pastoral care. He removed from Chumleigh to Penzance, in Cornwall."

To this last mentioned place he retired from a scene endeared to him by his paternal roof, and his father's sepulchre, and accepted the invitation of a little flock to preach to them the glad tidings of a Saviour's love. His acceptance and success left him no reason to regret his removal. In a communication to a friend, he thus mentioned the effect which followed his labors :

"The Spirit of God is usefully moving upon the hearts of men here. Through my preaching, several are awakened and setting their faces towards Zion. Some very vicious and debauched characters are reformed ; the young men show great seriousness, and I have great hopes of several of them ; and what makes all this the more remarkable, is, that there was a strange lukewarmness among professors themselves when I came hither. The church seemed to have a name that it lived, but was dead."

His biographer adds :

"The prosperity which attended Mr. Darracott's ministry at Penzance was greatly promoted by private means, which are of far greater importance than many seem to imagine. That pastoral visits and social meetings for private devotions ought not to preclude opportunities for study, nor induce a habit of desultory preaching, is readily admitted ; for this would be sacrificing the primary means of usefulness to the secondary. But after employing in the study as much time as is consistent with the preservation of health, and essential to the mental improvement which good preaching requires, sufficient leisure will still be left for abundant pastoral attentions, without which the flock will never prosper."

While laboring among his people with ardor and success, Mr. Darracott was, in the year 1738, seized with an alarming disease, which he represented to a friend as afflicting him less by threatening his life, than by disappointing the hopes he had indulged of greater efforts and success in his ministry. He removed to Barnstaple for his health, where he passed several of the first months of 1739, and employed himself in such means of usefulness as were within his reach and ability. As he recovered his health, he was advised that the air of Penzance was unsafe for him, and he renounced the design of returning to that place. "The Presbyterian congregation at Wellington, in Somersetshire, being destitute of a pastor, and having heard of his situation and character, were, happily for them, induced to give him an invitation, which led to his permanent settlement," in another portion of his Master's vineyard.

"With pleasure" (says the compiler of these Memoirs) "we see that no inferior motives, but that the hand of God removed him from a field of labor which promised so abundant a harvest :—For the consideration which some urged, that Penzance was at a great distance from his relations and estate, was unworthy of a minister of Christ. Every genuine minister of Christ enters upon the work voluntarily ; but when he has put his hand to the plough, he is forbidden to look back upon his friends, and estates, and pleasant residences, upon pain of being pronounced unfit for the kingdom of God. Wo to the minister, who is not guided by his Master's interest, as his polar star ! The most paradisaical spot is blasted by the Saviour's frown and the loveliest circle of friendship may soon be converted into the haunt of discord and the furies."

Mr. Darracott went to reside at Wellington early in the year 1741. He had before occasionally preached there for some time. The town contained but a few thousand inhabitants, and the congregation with which he was immediately connected, formed but a small part of the population. There were but twenty eight members of the church. He, however, did not linger on the verge of the field, contenting himself with looking about and speculating upon modes of *future* usefulness. He instantly began to work, and the effects were immediately perceptible. He accepted the call of the church, (not of the congregation merely) to become their pastor, and was ordained November 11th. 1741. On the evening of this day, and also of the first sabbath on which he administered the Lord's Supper, he recorded some very appropriate and solemn reflections, which are copied in the book before us—and they certainly were auspicious omens. If God has promised to fulfil the desires of them that fear him, it could not be doubted that such aspirations after usefulness would be indulged with a merciful answer. Many are ambitious to shine before men in public services, who little regard their appearance before God in the closet. But what hope can be entertained of that man's success, who regards his ordination as a ceremonious exhibition only—a closing of a bargain with his parishioners for service as their “teacher of piety, religion and morality,” and who enters upon his work without depositing one intense and humble prayer at the foot of the cross?

Soon after he was settled in his pastoral charge, he married a descendant of a puritan confessor, whose fine person was inspired with such a mind and heart as he deserved. As he had no mercenary nor ambitious views in forming this connexion, it was highly blessed of God. “She found in him all the generous tenderness implied in the sacred name of husband; and his heart, alike unfitted for the solitude of celibacy and the contentions of inauspicious marriage, found in her repose from the fatigues of his ministry, and solace under the afflictions of life.”

Many of our readers, we doubt not, have been forcibly struck with the remarks of Scott, (editor of the family Bible) on the subject of ministers' marriages, as given in the interesting “Life” written and published by his son. The Rev. Dr. Miller of New Jersey, in his invaluable “Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits,” has also borne an equally decided testimony against the venial and degrading matches, by which some of the professed ministers of Him who had not where to lay his head, have brought reproach upon the cause of religion. “The spirit of the commercial world,” says Scott, “having long corroded the professors of the Gospel, is now making havoc among ministers. The plan of marrying rich wives would have made St. Paul dolefully cry out, *All seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ.*”

If it is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, it is surely not to be expected that a minister who *seeks after* earth and *makes haste* to be rich, will manifest a very deep solicitude to assist the entry of others. As actions speak louder than words, and example is more powerful than precept, his exhortations to labor not for the meat which perisheth, and to trust not in uncertain riches, will produce little effect. We have not seen, in this country, the extent of the mischief which Dr. Scott deplored in England; and we pray that we never may.

After Mr. Darracott's ordination and marriage,

"He pursued his labors with new zeal, and the Redeemer crowned them with augmented blessings. His hearers increased to such an amount as constantly to overflow the place of worship, which however served to display the purity of his motives and his freedom from vanity; for in all his correspondence he mentions only that which is the grand end of hearing—the conversion of souls to God, and the increased dominion of religion over the hearts of professed Christians. Those evidences of his usefulness were continually inspiring him with fresh delights, so that the eight and twenty members of the church, soon saw themselves surrounded at the Lord's Table by accessions far beyond their own number."

"To the ordinary addresses from the pulpit, he added letters written to those whom his sermons had failed to impress, or whose impressions were but recent. Sometimes, instead of sending, he would read them to those for whom they were intended. Thus he gave a more solemn address than ordinary conversation allows, while yet he avoided the appearance of formal preaching."

In six years from his ordination, there were added to his church one hundred and twelve souls, "a list of names," said he, "which I would not part with for the joys of the whole earth." His church and congregation continued to increase; their house of worship was enlarged, in order to receive those who flocked to attend his preaching; and his heart was also enlarged, and panted for the salvation of all men. He took a lively interest in the triumph of religion, wherever it was enjoyed, and by whatever instrument it was produced. He became acquainted with the most eminent preachers of his day. In 1750, he received a visit from Whitefield, as he was on his way to embark for this country. In a letter to Lady Huntingdon (whose religious character is well known, at least to our elder readers) Whitefield observed, that Mr. Darracott was "a flaming, successful preacher of the gospel, and I think may justly be styled THE STAR IN THE WEST."

Mr. Whitefield, while on this visit, preached several times at Wellington, and with great effect. Mr. Darracott had none of that narrow, envious spirit which is sometimes too clearly exhibited. He did not nibble at Whitefield's fame, and feel as if his own reputation was in danger of an eclipse. He sat at the feet of the stranger whom he had invited to preach to his flock, hoping that where himself had failed, another might succeed in rousing the attention of the careless, and consoling the heart of the desponding. Every minister, who is meanly jealous of his own

consequence with his people, would do well to reflect,—‘ If I take care of Christ’s honor, he will take care of mine.’

In the autumn of 1751, Dr. Doddridge, being advised to take a voyage to Lisbon for his health, visited his pupil, as he passed through Wellington towards his place of embarkation. ‘ Mr. Darracott was the last friend he visited in his native country, and it may easily be conceived that the sight of such a disciple, in the zenith of his usefulness, afforded exquisite delight to him who had trained him up for the ministry.

“ The friendship between these two devoted servants of Christ was highly honorable to both. Darracott paid a willing homage to the literary eminence of his tutor, who felt himself honored and blessed in the superior usefulness of his pupil. Very lovely and pleasant were they in their lives, and in death they were not long divided. For though Doddridge consoled himself, in the prospect of death, with the hope that one whom he had trained for the ministry would long survive him to carry on the work now dropping from *his* tremulous hands, it seemed good to Him who forms polished instruments, but can do without them, to call away Darracott, soon to rejoin his honored friend in the mansions of immortal bliss.”

During the eight short years of Mr. Darracott’s surviving his tutor, he was laboriously and successfully engaged in his Master’s business. His growing family was, however, but slenderly provided for at Wellington—and his reputation attracted invitations from other churches. He was embarrassed as to the course of duty ; but communicating with his friends and disclosing his condition, he received pecuniary assistance, and resolved not to leave a scene of so much usefulness as that in which he had so long been an actor. His labors continued to be blessed with visible success ; and success increased, and cheered, and lightened his labors. Every month, he received some into his church, and proposed others to its communion. At one time the whole congregation were under serious impressions. This is what perhaps few ministers in England had then been able to say, though such scenes had not been rare in this country.

In 1755, he published his “ Scripture marks of salvation,” which were originally preached as sermons, and were requested by his hearers in a more permanent form, that the closet might revive the impressions made in the church. This pamphlet, which we have never seen, is said by Mr. Bennett to have been warm with the devotions of the writer’s heart, and adapted to turn the attention exclusively to an examination of the heart and conscience of the reader. It was extensively circulated in England and Scotland—though the distribution of tracts was not then much attended to. In 1757, he exerted himself, with great zeal and success, in behalf of the poor ; and prepared to form a society for the Reformation of Manners. This proposal encountered scarcely any opposition. A society was formed, and the laws for the observance of the sabbath were enforced in the most judicious manner, and with the happiest effects.

At the close of this year, (1757) the number of the communicants in his church was increased to nearly three hundred. *He extended his sphere of labor by visiting the adjacent towns and villages to bring wanderers into the fold of Christ.* He exerted himself among the soldiers that were quartered or stopped near him, in their removals from one part of the kingdom to the other; and we have reason to believe, that he was the instrument of turning many of their hearts in a new and heavenly direction.

The time now drew near that this faithful servant should return to account with Him that sent him; and those who had been taught by him how to live, were now to learn of him how to die. The first onset of the disease which removed him from the world, was not fatal. He recovered partially, from several attacks, and was enabled again to preach. His biographer states that the first confident expectation of death, which Mr. D. expressed, was when a month elapsed without any addition to his church. "Now," said he, "I believe I am near my end; my work is done, and I am going home to my rest." With this impression of approaching death (to him no gloomy one) he administered the Lord's Supper, for the last time, December 3d. 1758. On the evening of that day he composed a meditation, a farewell to the world, which was published p. 629 of our last volume.

His last illness (which continued about three months) gave him much excruciating pain; but he was sustained by faith and hope, and enjoyed not only the *peace* which the Saviour has *promised* to his disciples, but the *transport* which he sometimes *vouchsafes*. We do not regard the raptures of a dying bed as conclusive proof of a holy heart. Nor are we certain that the publication of the last words of ecstasy and triumph which sometimes escape the lips about to be sealed forever, have, always, a salutary effect. We therefore forbear to quote the valedictions of Mr. Darracott: Not that we have the slightest cause to suspect him of delirium, or hypocrisy, or self-delusion—but because we fear that many are inclined to make such scenes the test of religion, and to indulge in needless anxiety respecting the condition of their friends who may die without the language of exultation, though they had lived the life of faith and love, of contrition and obedience.

Mr. Darracott died on the 14th, of March, 1759, in the forty second year of his age, and, we doubt not, entered upon the distinguished rewards of those who turn many to righteousness.

"On opening his Will, it was found to contain, besides the disposal of his property, the following statement:—

"It is my will and desire that I may be buried the fourth or fifth day after my decease about one o'clock in the morning; and that the time be kept secret from all but such as are hereafter mentioned, who are the only persons I desire may attend me to my last bed. At the grave, I would have nothing said, but let them commit my flesh to the dust, in cheerful hope of a resurrection to eternal life; let them all be concerned to give me a joyful meeting at the great day."

"It is also my desire, that my dear brother, the Rev. Mr. Fawcett be sent for, to preach my funeral sermon, about a month or six weeks after my decease, as shall suit his own conveniency. I would not have him say a word in praise of me, but tell the people, that having loved them, I loved them unto the end ; and as a proof of it, have made choice of this word. 'Therefore, my brethren, dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, dearly beloved.' Phil. iv. 1. God will help my dear brother to carry home the exhortation upon their hearts, and that they will carefully attend to all the affectionate arguments by which the exhortation is urged. My further desire is, that the sermon may be printed, and that my dear people would not fail to have each of them one, to be with them when they will see my face no more."

The funeral was conducted according to Mr. Darracott's directions. But though he evidently designed to avoid attracting a crowd to his grave, the time could not be kept entirely secret, and immense multitudes attended at that early hour. The darkness was dispelled by their numerous torches, and its silence broken by their sighs, intermingled with praises of their deceased pastor.

The funeral sermon, which Mr. Fawcett preached at Wellington, April 15, exactly a month after his friend's decease, was, by his command, silent concerning his praise. The attentive multitudes, their sighs and tears, sufficiently proclaimed the worth of their departed shepherd. And in the picture of a faithful pastor, which Mr. Fawcett drew, he manifestly intended to give the likeness of his friend.

The concluding chapter of the book, from which we have already made so many extracts, contains a very well written summary of Mr. Darracott's character. We trust our readers will pardon us for inserting a few passages.

"His disposition, says his biographer, whether it should be ascribed wholly to religion, or in some measure to natural temperament, was very lovely. For, with all that ardor which endeared him to the church and to his friends, he was gentle and forgiving to his enemies. It was frequently observed of him, that, bold as a lion in the pulpit, he was, in the intercourse of life, meek as a lamb. Amidst considerable opposition, he was never roused to anger. In all his letters, he wisely abstained from any mention of his enemies ; and when a member of his family expressed a resolution to have no dealings with a tradesman who had injured him, he strongly censured the spirit, insisting that no difference should be made, except in favor of the offender.

"Though he was a very captivating *preacher*, he would not, as a writer of sermons, have acquired celebrity from the press. The fire of his heart, the light of his eye, the affection of his tone, and the solemnity of his manner, communicated an inexpressible interest, and made common thoughts appear striking."

"Mr. Darracott was still more distinguished as a *pastor* than a preacher. He was far from resembling those whose neglect of their flocks reminds us of what the sacred writer says of the ostrich, that leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in the sand, and forgetteth that the foot of the traveller may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. Mr. D. watched with unwearied diligence, for the fruit of his preaching."

"If those who are entering on the work of the ministry may here learn that with moderate abilities they may indulge the hope of distinguished usefulness, they see also, that to consecrate themselves to this object, is to secure a life of happiness. While many are fretting at the weight of their labors, the obscurity of their station, or the smallness of their income ; this good man esteemed it his felicity to have no time to spare ; his honor to hide himself where he might

best promote the divine glory ; and his wealth to put others in possession of the durable riches of righteousness."

"Far from repining that he was exiled to the narrow sphere of a little country town, his enlarged heart told him that his station demanded more than he had time or strength to accomplish. The pecuniary embarrassments, which he felt, were but momentary, for his wants were soon supplied ; and while they lasted, the strength of his faith and the ardor of his zeal prevented them from doing more than proving to his own conscience, and to others, that he could willingly make any sacrifice for Christ and his cause. The care of his family, he cheerfully devolved upon Him whom he had served in the Gospel ;—nor was his confidence vain."

The last fifty pages of this work are filled with extracts from Mr. Darracott's correspondence. We do not think they add greatly to the value, or to the interest of the volume.

A reflection obtrudes itself, on closing this little book, respecting the doctrines of which God is pleased to bless the preaching. Ministers may describe forever the beauties of virtue, and the rewards of self-respect—may portray the vulgarity of vice, and exhort to aspirations after the elevated consciousness of an unreproaching heart—but the effects of Darracott's preaching will not ensue.

"Ah, tinkling cymbal, and high sounding brass,
Smitten in vain! Such music cannot charm
The eclipse that intercepts truth's heavenly beam,
And chills and darkens a wide wandering soul."

The course of *action* also, which secures success to a pastor, is strikingly exhibited in the book we have been examining. The mere routine of ministrations on the sabbath will not satisfy the conscience or the wishes of a minister who is worthy to be accounted a descendant of the pilgrim fathers of New England.

He must be instant in season and out of season—must attend personally and thoroughly to the welfare of his charge, or he cannot anticipate nor receive the reward of a faithful servant. So thought Darracott, and he acted accordingly. So thought and acted the clerical fathers who nurtured the churches of this land. And so think and act their legitimate children in the ministry.

A tear will escape from the pious reader, as he recalls the history of the school of Doddridge, while perusing the narrative of the life of so lovely and so successful a pupil of that sainted master. And more bitter tears will flow, if he turn his thoughts to an institution in our own vicinity, originally consecrated "to Christ and the Church," but now the boasted "bulwark" of a system of religion which its founders would have deemed treachery to the Captain of their salvation to adopt or countenance.

THE SCRIPTURES NOT A REVELATION, BUT THE RECORD OF A REVELATION : *An Article in the Christian Examiner for January, 1830.*

OUR last number contained an article on the question, *What constitutes Infidelity?*, in which, after meeting this inquiry, the writer shows, by numerous quotations from standard Unitarian authors in Europe and America, that *they* fall clearly on the side of the Infidel. We deem it a striking coincidence, that on the day of the issuing of our number, an article was published in the Christian Examiner, with a running title, "The Scriptures not a Revelation but the record of a Revelation," making fuller disclosures of the views of the conductors of that work on the subject in question, and confirming the conclusions we had published. We shall occupy a few pages in examining and exposing the contents of this article, so far as they relate to the inspiration of the Scriptures.

"The question," says the Examiner, "between the believer and the unbeliever is, whether God has made special and supernatural communications of his wisdom and will to man, and whether the Bible contains those communications:" "Not whether the words of this communication are grammatically the best words; not whether the illustrations are rhetorically the best illustrations; not whether the arguments are logically the best arguments; but the question is, *whether there is any communication at all.*"

Now we deny that the question, as here stated, is the proper question between the believer and unbeliever, or the Christian and the Infidel. We do this for two reasons. In the first place, many acknowledged Infidel writers would answer this question in precisely the same manner as the Christian. Lord Bolingbroke professed to believe that "God had made special and supernatural communications of his wisdom and will to man," and that "the Bible contains those communications." "Genuine Christianity," says he "is *contained* in the Scriptures. It is *the word of God.*" The same remark may be extended to Hobbes, Tindal, Morgan, Dodwell, Gibbon, and perhaps others.* But, secondly, any person may believe that "God has made special and supernatural communications of his wisdom and will to man," and that "the Bible contains those communications," and still not receive the Bible as the truth of God, or bow to it as a standard. 'God has made a revelation to men, and the Bible contains this revelation; but whereabout in the Bible is it? and how much is there of it? and what particular parts are to be considered as revelation, and what not?' These are points which none *can* satisfactorily determine, and concerning which there must be great and endless diversity of opinion. One throws away this chapter or verse, as no part of the revelation; another that; and another that; and thus the whole Bible is virtu-

* See our number for January, 1830, pp. 5, 6.

ally discarded, while in appearance and profession it is retained. 'There is a revelation in the Bible ;—but no mortal can decide infallibly, without a new revelation, what it is, or where it is, or how much there is of it ; and hence every one is entitled to receive such parts, and such only, as to him appear consistent and agreeable.*'

The real question between the believer and the infidel was properly stated and settled in our last number ; pp. 7---10.

"The Christian receives the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as coming from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of his faith, and the rule of his conduct ; but the infidel, whatever he may profess or pretend, never in reality does this.—The intelligent Christian is not averse to sober and just criticism, in application to the Scriptures. He wishes the canon of Scripture to be investigated and established, and that whatever is included in the canon may be properly explained. He wishes to possess a correct copy, if possible, as the inspired writers left it ; and he wishes this copy to be correctly interpreted, if possible according to 'the mind of the Spirit.' But when all this is done to his satisfaction, he has no further questions to ask. He receives it all. He says, with Chillingworth in his better days, "No demonstration can be stronger than this : God hath said so, therefore it is true."

But the infidel is not satisfied with having a correct copy of the Scriptures, and with having it correctly interpreted. He does not then bow to it, as a standard. There is a certain part of it, if not the whole, which, in his estimation, is not the authoritative word of God."

Brought to this test, it was shown in our last, that the conductors of the Christian Examiner fall clearly on the side of the infidel. The same more evidently appears from the disclosures in the article now before us. *No manner of inspiration*, not even a general *superintendence*, is here admitted as extending to the *language* of the Bible.

"Many of the most learned and profound Orthodox scholars have given up the doctrine of immediate suggestion, and retain only that of a general superintendence.† But we surely may remind them, that the Scriptures themselves furnish as little warrant for the doctrine of superintendence as for that of suggestion.

The doctrine of superintendence, undoubtedly, comes not from the Scriptures, but from what is thought to be the exigency of the case. It is introduced to save the sacred writings from the charge of possible error ; a charge which we shall by and by undertake to show, does not, in ANYTHING MATERIAL, attach to them, on what we think to be a more rational and unincumbered theory. We see no need of supposing the apostles, for instance, to have spoken and written under any other influence than that of truth and goodness—truth supernaturally communicated to them, but not by them supernaturally taught.

The Examiner insists, that the sacred writers had *no need* of inspiration, in composing and publishing the sacred volume.

* Rammohun Roy, whom the Christian Register places "in the very first rank of Christian Theologians," selected and published, a few years since, such passages of the New Testament as he thought proper for circulation among his countrymen. This work has been republished, with high encomiums, by Unitarians in this country. Mr. Jefferson, who claimed to be a Unitarian, and whom Dr Priestley represents as "almost, if not altogether, such an one as we (Unitarians) are," also made a selection, from the New Testament, of such of "the precepts of Jesus" as he thought to be genuine, and worthy of so distinguished a Reformer.

† This representation of the views of "many of the most learned and profound Orthodox scholars" respecting the Bible, we believe is wholly unfounded.

"What is a revelation? It is simply the communication of certain truths to mankind; truths, indeed, which they could not otherwise have fully understood or satisfactorily determined; but truths nevertheless as easy to be communicated as any other. *Why then is there any more need of supernatural assistance in this case, than in any other?*" "What particular truth, that either does belong to revelation, or has been conceived to belong to it, *requires an infallible style, or a supernatural influence for its communication?*"

Accordingly, it is urged, with a variety of illustration, that the Bible is a *human composition*.

"The composition of the Bible is looked upon as a *human work*—a work produced by the *natural operation of human thought and feeling*."—"These writings (the Scriptures) so far as their composition is concerned, are to be regarded as possessing a properly and *purely human character*."—"The record was human. It was, strictly speaking, and every way, a human act. The manner, the style, the phraseology, the choice of words, the order of thought, the selection of figures, comparisons, arguments, to enforce the communication, was *altogether a human work*. It was as purely human, as peculiarly individual in the case of every witness, as his accent, attitude, or gesture, when delivering his message."*

The writer of this article speaks in some places as though the question between Unitarians and the Orthodox respected *merely the language* of Scripture—as though *he* believed that the *thoughts*, the *ideas*, were of divine inspiration.

"We see ideas, that we ascribe to inspiration; but we see no evidence, we can discern no appearance of any supernatural influence created upon the style either to make it perfect, or to prevent it from being imperfect.

"If such, then, be the natural impression arising from the perusal of the Scriptures, we are so to receive them, unless they themselves direct us otherwise. Do they direct us otherwise? Do they anywhere tell us that the manner of writing, the style, the words, came from immediate divine suggestion, or were subject to miraculous superintendence?"

The same writer asserts, in another place, that Unitarians do not deny the inspiration "of *ideas*" in the New Testament, but "only of words." p. 355.

Now if the question between the two parties respected *merely the language* of the Bible, it would be one of vital importance. Our Saviour promised the Spirit to his disciples to teach them, as well *how*, as *what* they should speak. And Paul thought it important to acquaint the Corinthians, that he spake, 'not in *words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but *which the Holy Ghost teacheth*.' "If we should admit," says Dr. Woods, "that the divine superintendence and guidance afforded to the inspired writers had no relation at all to the manner in which they exhibited either doctrines or facts; how easily might we be disturbed with doubts, in regard to the propriety of some of their representations? We should most certainly consider them as liable to all the inadvertencies and mistakes, to which uninspired

* It is implied here, as it is in other parts of the article under examination, that the characteristic differences of style in the sacred writers goes to disprove their inspiration. We have no time to discuss this old infidel objection to the *Word of God*; nor is it necessary. Those who wish to see it removed may consult Dr. Woods' Lectures on Inspiration, pp. 25—28, and Wilson's Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, pp. 317—331.

men are commonly liable; and we should think ourselves perfectly justified in undertaking to charge them with real errors and faults as to style, and to show how their language might have been improved; and, in short, to treat their writings just as we treat the writings of Shakspeare and Addison. ‘Here,’ we might say, ‘Paul was unfortunate in the choice of words; and here his language does not express the ideas which he must have intended to convey. Here the style of John was inadvertent; and here it was faulty; and here it would have been more agreeable to the nature of the subject, and would have more accurately expressed the truth, had it been altered thus.’”

We hear it questioned, in the article before us, whether “some of the illustrations” of Scripture “are judicious,” and whether some “of the arguments of Paul are logical.” “Some things” in the Bible, it is said, “were hastily written, some things negligently,” and “some things not in the exact logical order of thought.” “The light” of revelation, “in its visitations to the earth, has struggled through the medium of human imperfection, through *mists of prejudice*, and *clouds*.”—It is plain from this specimen, as well as from the nature of the case, that were the *language* of Scripture wholly uninspired, there would be no end of cavilling in regard to it, and the Bible itself could no longer be regarded as an infallible directory in the things of religion.

The Bible, it should be remembered, was not given us as a philosophical speculation, with which to exercise and amuse the understanding; but as a system of rules, “a code of *laws*,” which men are to obey in this world, and by which they are to be tried and judged hereafter. Suppose, then, that the Congress of the United States should enact a code of laws for the government of the nation, but should neglect to reduce them to writing, leaving it to the auditors and reporters in the halls and galleries to publish them in such form and manner as they thought best. Who would feel the least confidence in such laws? Who could tell, for certainty, what the laws were? Who could know whether he had kept them, or transgressed them? And if arraigned for trial on such laws, who could more than conjecture whether he ought to be acquitted or condemned? The truth is, that such laws would be no laws at all. They would not come *authenticated* to the nation, and not an individual would be under the least obligation to regard them.—So, in the case before us, if the Bible, as to the *language* of it, is not from God, then we have no *authenticated* revelation from God. All we know of his laws, his purposes, his promises, his threatenings, the way of life, and the way of death, we are left to gather from mere *human* testimony—the testimony of those who were as weak, as ignorant, as forgetful, and as liable to mistakes and prejudices, as ourselves; and what confidence, on such ground, can be reposed

in the Bible? We have not the word of God, but the mere testimony of men, on which to rely; and who can pretend to determine whether the foundation of his hope is sure?

These remarks go to show, that, were the question between the Orthodox and Unitarians such as has been pretended—did it respect merely the *language* of Scripture, it would, in that case, be a momentous question, going to the very foundation of our faith, and of our everlasting hopes. But the question, thus stated, great as it may be, is not the sole, or perhaps the principal one in this controversy. For in regard to some portions of the Bible, Unitarians no more believe the *ideas* inspired, than they do the words. This is evident from the article before us.

“The inspired penmen usually wrote in conformity with the philosophy of their respective ages—in conformity, therefore, with some portions of natural and metaphysical philosophy *that are false.*”

“It cannot be denied that there are some slight *discrepancies* in the evangelical narratives.”

“There are among our sacred books, *mistakes in philosophy, and discrepancies in statements of facts.*”

But in these “*mistakes in philosophy, and discrepancies in statements of facts,*” the fault must have been, not in the language only, but in the *ideas* intended to be conveyed. Again,

“Unbelievers have derived more plausible and just objections from the prevailing theological assumptions with regard to our sacred books, than from any other quarter. The attacks which are usually made upon the philosophy of Moses, the imprecations of David, the differences among the apostles, the obscurities of Paul, and upon instances of puerility, coarseness and indelicacy in style, or inappositeness in illustration, are all of this nature.”

But in “the philosophy of Moses, the imprecations of David,” and “the differences (contradictions) among the apostles,” the fault could not have been in the mere words, but in the *sense*, the *meaning*, which the words expressed.

The writer before us makes a similar distinction to that of Dr. Ware, between “the doctrines” of the sacred writers, and their “arguments, illustrations, and topics of persuasion,” considering the former as of divine inspiration, but the latter as “the suggestions of their own minds.” This distinction he illustrates in the following manner:

“‘Whoever appeals to reason,’ it has been very justly said, ‘waves, *quo ad hoc*, his claim to inspiration.’ When an inspired teacher says to us, ‘This doctrine is true’—that is one thing—we receive the declaration on his simple authority. But when he says, ‘I can prove this to you by a series of arguments’—that is another thing. When he says, ‘this is true, *because*’—the utterance of that word arouses our reason. It is not implicit faith that is then demanded, but an attentive consideration of the force of arguments. The thing argued demands faith; but the argument, from its very nature, appeals to reason; and it is the very office of reason to judge whether the argument is sound and sufficient. And so when a sacred writer says, ‘This doctrine is true, and it is *like* such a thing, or it may be so illustrated,’ he appeals to our judgement and taste, and we may, without in the least questioning the thing asserted, inquire into the fitness, force, and elegance of the illustration, allegory, or figure by which it is set forth.”

But if the arguments and illustrations of the sacred writers were from their own minds, then the *ideas* conveyed in these arguments and illustrations were *not inspired*, any more than the words used to express them.

According to the theory advanced in this article, it does not appear that the office of a prophet or an apostle differed materially from that of the ordinary preacher.

"When prophet or apostle presents himself to us as a messenger from God, we receive him in the simple and actual character, which has been marked out in this discussion. We consider him as saying, 'I bear to you, a message from God, to which I demand reverent heed; I give you, from divine inspiration, assurance of certain solemn and momentous truths; but I do not say that every word and phrase I use, every simile, and allegory, and consideration by which I endeavor to explain or enforce my message, is divine, any more than that my countenance, speech, and action are divine. The distinction is easy, and you ought not to misapprehend it. I speak to you from God; but still I am a man. I speak after the manner of men, and for the peculiarities of my own manner, mind, country, and age, I do not presume to make the Universal and Eternal wisdom answerable.' It is as when an earthly government sends its ambassador to a revolted province. The person invested with such a character has a two fold office to discharge. He has to lay down propositions, to make offers of forgiveness and reconciliation. These are from the government. He has to explain and urge these propositions and offers, by such language, illustrations, and arguments as the exigency requires. These are from himself. 'It is thus,' might the ambassador of God say, 'it is thus that I address the children of men. My message is divine; my manner of delivering it, is human.'"

But is it not true of every authorized preacher of the Gospel, that he is an ambassador from God to a revolted world? His message is *divine*;—received, not indeed by immediate inspiration, but from those who were inspired. But his language, illustrations, and arguments are *human*. These are from himself. In what important respect, therefore, does he differ from an apostle? And why may we not, on this ground, censure the style, the language, the illustrations, the arguments, and, to a certain extent, the sentiments of the apostles, with as great freedom and with as much propriety, as we do those of an ordinary sermon?

The views of Unitarians respecting the Bible, as disclosed in the article here considered, are briefly these:—*No manner of inspiration, not even a general superintendence, attaches to the language of Scripture. It is the word of man, and not of God, and is to be regarded, entirely and throughout, as a human composition.** And as to the *ideas* conveyed by this language, though some of them are inspired, others are not, and every one must judge for himself, (though he has no certain means of judging) how much to receive as a revelation from God, and how much to impute to the ignorance, the prejudice, the ingenuity, or the device of man.

* The Christian Register, remarking on this article in the Examiner, says, "It is unanswerably shown that they (the Scriptures) make *no claim to be the work of a literal inspiration.*" With this assertion, let the reader compare 2 Peter i. 21. 2 Tim. iii. 16. Gal. i. 11. 1 Cor. ii. 13. and xiv. 37. 1 Thess. ii. 13,

The course which this discussion has taken, and the disclosures to which it has led, are, in our view, deeply serious. It was introduced by us, not lightly, nor with a wish to injure, but under a high sense of responsibility, and with the most solemn convictions of duty. That an outcry would be raised, and that hard things would be said of us, with a view to prejudice the public mind, and turn it off from the momentous question in debate, we had no reason to doubt. But we are not to be thus intimidated or restrained. The Bible is too dear to us to be given up—as a whole, or in part—without a struggle. The eternal interests of myriads now living, and of generations yet to live, are of too much consequence to be, at once and so readily, abandoned. When we see efforts making which we sincerely believe, so far as their influence reaches, go, not to bedim, but to extinguish the light from heaven, we cannot cease to warn our fellow travellers through a dark and treacherous world of the dangers that await them.

The conductors of the *Christian Examiner*, if we understand their allusion, regard us as ‘exulting with apparent delight over what we profess to think their fatal skepticism.’ But that we exult or rejoice on account of their skepticism, (we *fear* their fatal skepticism,) is far from the truth. We rejoice, indeed, that the cloak of concealment is beginning to be thrown off, and that they are disposed to explain to the world their views. We commend their frankness in so doing, and entreat them to keep nothing back. But that we rejoice on account of their adopting such views, is most untrue, and to throw out insinuations to that effect we think uncharitable. We are conscious of no unfriendly feeling towards the conductors of the Unitarian periodicals, or those associated with them. They are our fellow mortals, hasting with us to the judgement, and ‘our heart’s desire and prayer to God for them is, that they may be saved.’ That we regard their system generally, and especially their views of the Bible, as of destructive tendency, we have never attempted to conceal. They are views which we shall endeavor, by all fair methods, to expose and refute. We shall continue to warn our fellow men against them, and do all in our power to limit their prevalence. But so far from rejoicing that any around us have adopted such views, and such a system, we should rejoice with joy unutterable to see them abandoning it. We would go forth to meet them with tears of gratitude and joy, could we see them returning to the religion of their fathers, acknowledging the Bible as the *word of God*, and humbly embracing those holy doctrines, which he has revealed for their ‘instruction in righteousness.’

THE FIRST SETTLERS OF NEW ENGLAND; OR CONQUEST OF THE PEQUODS, NARRAGANSETTS, AND POKANOKETS. *As related by a Mother to her Children.* By a Lady of Massachusetts. Boston: Munroe and Francis. 1829. pp. 282.

WE know nothing of the writer of this volume, except that she is a professed believer and admirer of modern Unitarianism, and consequently a violent opposer of that "system of religion which was planted on this soil by the first settlers of New England." The result of her inquiries, as here exhibited, and as they stand connected with the subject of religion, may be stated in the following propositions.

1. Our pilgrim fathers, "the first settlers of New England," were monsters of injustice and cruelty.

They "rent asunder the bands of humanity and brotherhood, thus destroying social happiness and confidential intercourse, and giving force and scope to the most hateful passions." p. 94. They destroyed the natives "with as little compassion and compunction as" they would "the wild beasts of the forests," and manifested "a hard and merciless disposition, truly unnatural and deplorable." pp. 32, 37.

2. The horrid cruelties, practised by the Pilgrims, were the necessary result of their Calvinistic principles.

"We may in truth imagine, that a sect,—who ascribe to God passions highly vindictive and unjust,—who represent this universal Parent as having formed rational creatures for the express purpose of inflicting on them torments the most excruciating and endless, without allowing them any chance or power to escape,—and who also believe, that the small number whom he has ordained to be happy, have been redeemed by the sufferings and blood of a benevolent and perfect being, who has given himself a willing victim to satisfy divine vengeance,—may have believed themselves authorized to inflict all the evil in their power on wretches who are born to suffer."* pp. 30, 31.

3. The Calvinistic principles of the Pilgrims, which instigated them to such shocking barbarities, were derived from the Old Testament.

"The conviction of the Jews having been set apart from all other nations by God to preserve a knowledge of his true character and attributes, and authorized to destroy the Canaanites, whom he had purposely left to follow their own wicked devices, is assuredly the strong hold of Calvinism; for, if it be admitted that God had chosen a people who were commanded to punish and exterminate a portion of His creatures who had been blinded and kept in ignorance of the truth, then is the doctrine of election firmly established." p. 95.

"The main prop of Calvinism is found in the election of the Jews, with all their vices, to be the peculiar favorites of heaven." p. 110.

Our fathers had "the vain belief of their being a chosen people, and, like the Israelites, authorized by God to destroy or drive out the heathen, as they styled the Indians." p. 32.

4. The Old Testament, though "highly valuable," as contain-

* This is a specimen of the manner in which the religious principles of our fathers are misrepresented and caricatured throughout the volume.

ing "many sublime passages and beautiful images," and an "interesting portion of ancient history," is, in many parts of it, untrue, unworthy of God, has no connexion with the religion of Jesus, and ought to be separated from it.—To this proposition, we ask the particular attention of our readers. If the work before us contains it, we make no apology for denominating it an *infidel* publication. If it does not contain it, we know not what meaning to attach to the terms.

"The sanguinary institutions of the Jews," (institutions which the Bible assures us were appointed of God,) "from which we have derived our crude and unworthy notions respecting the Deity, can have *no connexion* with the pure and heavenly religion of Jesus." p. 5.

"I have before stated to you the pernicious effects resulting from the supposition that the figurative style of writing, common in the Eastern world, should be construed as containing the literal import of what was related, and the evil consequences produced by associating with our benign religion the history and sanguinary transactions of the Israelites. Errors like these cannot be too much exposed, and we may venture to predict that Christianity will never fully exert its purifying influences till *this unhallowed connexion be dissolved.*" pp. 94, 95.

"To me it appears altogether wonderful to find highly gifted and benevolent men, who have abjured and denounced the base and incongruous dogmas which have so long obscured and marred the sublime doctrines of Christianity, still advocate the connexion supposed to subsist between the historical relations of the Old Testament, and the doctrines of the inspired teacher of the New Testament: or in any way admit a comparison of Moses and Christ, so highly derogatory to the character of this divine personage." p. 96.

"It is assuredly wonderful, and altogether irreconcilable with the dictates of reason and moral sensibility, that a book containing the history of a people whose vices create in unsophisticated minds a moral aversion too great to be overcome, should be acknowledged to have an intimate and necessary connexion with a belief in Jesus; and I am unable to repress the mingled emotions of shame and regret excited by reflecting on the extreme incongruity of exhibiting characters so utterly unworthy, as examples for imitation to a foreign people, with a view to prove the superior purity and efficacy of our religion, and prevent human sacrifices." pp. 104, 105.

"I have had frequent occasions to remark on the injury done to Christianity by the pernicious practice of associating with it the historical transactions and [divine] institutions of the Jews. It is by nourishing this root of iniquity, which may be likened to the parasite plant which blights and destroys the fair tree to which it clings for support, that ample scope has been afforded for the commission of those countless crimes which have been perpetrated under the sanction of religion." pp. 107, 108.

The rejection of the Old Testament "will relieve many from perplexing doubts relative to the divine attributes, which have appeared to them so contradictory and uncertain; while others will be reclaimed from skepticism who have been made to think that there is the same authority for believing in the Old Testament, as in the New. By rejecting those parts of the former which are so unsuitable and discordant to the spirit of the Gospel, with all those degrading and unworthy representations of the high and lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, it will brighten and make clear the path which has so long been encumbered with thorns." pp. 109, 110.

The Scriptures represent the ancient Jews as the *peculiar*, *chosen* people of God, favored, beyond all other people, with the means of religious instruction. "The Lord hath *chosen* Jacob unto himself, and Israel for his *peculiar treasure.*"*

* Ps. cxxxv. 4. See also Deut. vii. 6. xiv. 2. xxvi. 13. Is. xlv. 1, 2. &c.

But this sentiment, the writer of the work before us peremptorily denies.

"It appears to be wanting in respect for the moral attributes of the Deity to represent him as having chosen a people, so destitute of goodness, to be his peculiar favorites." p. 98.

"*Caroline.* You think, mother, there is sufficient proof that the Jews were not a favored people, or better instructed than other nations in the knowledge of God?"

"*Mother.* This, in my opinion, is susceptible of demonstration." p. 102.

The Bible represents the ceremonies of the Jewish worship as appointed of God, and ordered with a view to preserve them separate from the superstitions of the surrounding nations. Lev. xx. 24—26. But our authoress represents these ceremonies as strongly resembling those of the heathen, and in some instances as *copied* from them.

"The rites and ceremonies of the Jews *very nearly resembled* those of the neighboring nations, particularly those of Egypt, from whom they *copied* the garments of their priests." "The Cherubim resembled the Egyptian Isis, who was worshipped under a great variety of forms." p. 100.

5. The writer of this work has abundant charity for heathen and idolators, ancient and modern—for almost everything except Calvinism, which she represents as the most horrible superstition which ever infected the minds of men.

"The people of Egypt, like all other nations, worshipped one supreme Deity, whose most adorable attributes, power, wisdom, and goodness, were frequently personified, and under various forms received distinct homage. Gratitude, also, for the gifts esteemed most beneficial, led them to pay veneration to the ox, and some other animals, who most contributed to supply their wants, or to preserve them from danger or loss; and probably, like the Hindoos, as they perceived in all nature traces of divine goodness, they were led to recognise the Almighty in all His works. It appears wrong to me to call such a people idolators, though in many instances they may have transgressed the bounds of moderation." p. 70.

"I have before explained to you the notions entertained of inferior deities by ancient nations, who, in their prayers and votive offerings, hoped to receive, through their mediation and influence, the forgiveness of their sins, and to find favor in the sight of the great Parent of the universe; and they naturally believed that those who had been the benefactors of mankind while on earth, would still endeavor to preserve and intercede for them in another state of existence." p. 251.

"In the character and principles of Jesus, we recognize him as a teacher inspired by God to illustrate and confirm those divine impressions, which He hath graciously written on the heart. In the minds of our aborigines, this law *hath not been darkened or corrupted by superstition*. and they are guided by the *pure luster of that light which is from above*, when not contaminated by our vices." pp. 253, 254.

In the following extract, quoted with approbation from a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Upham of Salem, the religion of the Indians is represented as even *superior*, in some respects, to that of our fathers.

"These sons of the forest carried all their *household gods* away with them, as they slowly and reluctantly departed on their long and dismal journey toward the setting sun. And, even if they had imparted to their Christian

successors a portion of their own religious faith, it would not, perhaps, have been an injury. There was a *purity* and *sublimity* in the religion of the untaught Indian, which could not but have exerted a corrective and restraining influence upon the complicated and gloomy doctrines, towards which Christians were then inclined." p. 270.

The views of the writer respecting Calvinism, and the exuberance of her charity towards Calvinists of the present day, may be gathered from the following sentences.

"I have before had occasion to remark, that *no superstition could be compared to Calvinism in its demoralizing, petrifying effects*. However erroneous may be the belief of the Hindoos, their self-devotion has something in it great and impressive, because it is themselves who are the victims, nor do they, by any vain subtilty, expect to avoid responsibility." p. 117.

"The opponents to this benign system [Unitarianism] daily manifest the *same* inveteracy which has marked the proceedings of those who have, (whenever circumstances admitted,) put in execution every species of torture, imprisonment, and death, with a view to silence their adversaries, nor will this censure be deemed unmerited by those who attend to the denunciations which are perpetually fulminated against all who dissent from the self-elected judges, who contend for infallibility and exclusive privileges." pp. 108, 109.

"We know by sad experience, that whenever an opportunity is given [to Calvinists] for persecuting their opponents, they are all induced to join, or acquiesce in doing them *all the evil in their power*, in the full conviction that they are serving and honoring Him, whose high behest they are bound to fulfil." p. 115.

Having repeated the oft-refuted calumny that Servetus "was burned by a slow fire, *amidst the exultation and scoffs of Calvin*," the daughter replies,

"But you do not believe, mother, that all Calvinists approve of such horrible persecutions?"

"*Mother*. As that sect acknowledge Calvin to be their head and leader, we are compelled to suppose *they would deem themselves authorized to follow his example, whenever an opportunity presents*." p. 117.

6. As the writer believes the religion of the heathen to be preferable to that of her Orthodox neighbors, she of course considers all missionary operations (excepting those of the Deist, Rammohun Roy,) as nearly, if not entirely useless. Mr. Eliot's converts among the Indians were injured, rather than benefitted, by the change they had experienced.

"Sausaman, (who had been the counsellor, and pretended friend of Philip, but after, by the frequent solicitations of Mr. Eliot, whose convert he had previously been, joined the enemies of his country,) betrayed his master, and was made the principal instrument in his destruction. We have reason to suppose that the Indian converts were induced to believe it to be a part of their duty to *betray* their unbelieving countrymen, who were already doomed to never-ending wo for their unbelief." p. 77.

"The vast sums expended in vain and *nearly useless* endeavors to gain proselytes in foreign and far distant lands, would, if rightly improved, be of incalculable benefit at home." p. 278.

"The admiration, excited by the noble efforts of Rammohun Roy, to reclaim his own countrymen from idolatry and superstition, and teach them the path of duty, affords an important and striking lesson to others, to follow the example of this inestimable individual, whose magnanimous efforts have conferred infinitely greater benefits on the people of India, than *all the missionaries who have ever visited its shores*." p. 280.

We have thus given our readers some idea of this work, which is published as a conversation between a mother and her daughters, and is now circulating through New England. We have no room for extended remarks, nor do we think them necessary. The work is chiefly interesting, as it exhibits the views entertained by many, and beginning to be openly advanced, respecting the Old Testament. The lovers of the Bible will see in it the *tendency of things*, and the necessity of awaking to a sense of their danger.

The sympathy of the writer for the Indians, so far as founded on truth, and the interest she manifests on the subject of their threatened removal, we, of course, approve.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

From Jowett's Christian Researches.

House of the Dead.

While walking out, one evening, says Dr. Jowett, a few fields' distance from Deir el Kamr, with Hanna Doomani, the son of my host, to see a detached garden belonging to his father, he pointed out to me, near it, a small solid stone building, apparently a house: very solemnly adding, "*Kabbar béity*," *the sepulchre of our family*. It had neither door nor window. He then directed my attention to a considerable number of similar buildings, at a distance, which, to the eye, are exactly like houses; but which are, in fact, family mansions for the dead.

Perhaps this custom may have been of great antiquity; and may serve to explain some Scripture phrases. The prophet Samuel was buried in his house at Ramah: 1 Sam. xxv. 1: It could hardly be in his dwelling-house. Joab also, "was buried in his own house." 1 Kings ii. 34, "I know that thou wilt bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all the living." Job xxx. 23.

Psalms, cxxix. 6. "*Let them be as the grass upon the house tops, which withereth afore it groweth up.*"

In the morning, the master of the house laid in a stock of earth; which was carried up, and spread evenly on the top of the house, which is flat. The whole roof is thus formed of mere earth, laid on, and rolled hard and flat. On the top of every house is a large stone roller, for the purpose of hardening and flattening this layer of rude soil, so that the rain may not penetrate: but upon this surface, as

may be supposed, grass and weeds grow freely. It is to such grass that the Psalmist alludes, as useless and bad—"Let them be as the grass upon the house-tops, which withereth afore it groweth up."

Isaiah, lii. 2. "*Shake thyself from the dust; arise; sit down, O Jerusalem.*"

It is no uncommon thing to see an individual, or a group of persons, even when very well-dressed, sitting, with their feet drawn under them, upon the bare earth, passing whole hours in idle conversation. Europeans would require a chair; but the natives here prefer the ground. In the heat of summer and autumn, it is pleasant to them to while away their time in this manner under the shade of a tree. Richly adorned females, as well as men, may often be seen thus amusing themselves. As may naturally be expected, with whatever care they may, at first sitting down, choose their place, yet the flowing dress by degrees gathers up the dust: as this occurs, they from time to time, arise, adjust themselves, shake off the dust, and then sit down again. The captive daughter of Zion, therefore, brought down to the dust of suffering and oppression, is commanded to arise and shake herself from that dust, and then, with grace and dignity, and composure and security, to *sit down*; to take as it were, again, her seat and her rank amid the company of the nations of the earth, which had before afflicted her, and trampled her to the earth.

It may be proper to notice, that Bishop Lowth gives another rendering—*Arise, ascend thy lofty seat*—and quotes Eastern customs to justify the version: but I see no necessity for the alteration, although to English ears it may sound more appropriate. A person of rank in the East often sits down upon the ground, with his attendants about him.

The following illustration of the parable of the ten virgins, (Matt. xxv. 1—13) is by an English Clergyman now in India, once "the friend and coadjutor of Dr. Buchanan."

The luminaries mentioned in the parable are, in the original, *lampades*, in our translation rendered *lamps*. It would be needless to inform the classical scholar that *lampas* is not what ordinary English readers understand by a *lamp* (that being *luchnos*) but properly signifies a *torch*. It may be a question, however, in what manner oil was applied to such an instrument or luminary as a torch.

Now, what occurs in India, presents us with a ready answer. When we are going to travel at night through unfrequented places in that country, where keeping up a light is very important, we do not trust ourselves to a lantern, as in a town or station; but a man is hired, who carries in his right hand a kind of torch, having a large head of tow, or other bibulous substance, in his left a vessel, out of which he keeps occasionally pouring oil upon the lighted tow. This makes a large strong flame, much stronger than that of the wick of a lamp. The blaze brightens the whole path, and defies the power of rain or wind, to extinguish it.

Before I was set to thinking, by observing this, I remember sometimes inaccurately quoting Holy Scripture, by exhorting the people of a congregation to have oil *in their lamps*. I believe I was not singular: whereas if we look into St. Matthew we find no such expression; but it is there, 'Oil in their *vessels with their lamps*.'

ANECDOTE.

The following anecdote is related by Whiston. *Memoirs*, Vol. i. p. 362.

"There is a story, how a learned Friar of Italy, famous for his learning and preaching, was commanded to preach before the Pope at a year of Jubilee; and to be the better furnished, he repaired a good while before to Rome, to see the fashion of the Conclave, to accommodate his sermon the better. When the day came he was to preach, having ended his prayer, and looking a long time about, at last he cried with a loud voice three times, 'St. Peter was a fool—*St. Peter was a fool*—ST. PETER WAS FOOL!!' Which words being spoken, he came out of the pulpit. Being afterwards convented before the Pope, and asked why he so carried himself, he answered, 'Surely, holy Father, if a Priest may go to heaven abounding in wealth, honor and preferment, and live at ease, never or seldom to preach;—then surely, St. Peter was a fool, who took such a hard way, in travelling, in fasting, in preaching, to go thither.'

SOCIETY FOR PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL AMONG THE INDIANS AND OTHERS IN NORTH AMERICA.

In the notice of Dr. Wisner's sermon before this Society, contained in our last, we expressed our disappointment "at finding no treasurer's report published the present year." The following account of the state of the treasury has since been given to the public by Alden Bradford, Esq., Secretary of the Society.

"In Bank Stock, \$18,700—(2,000 of which was for six months only,) the income being \$698. In Insurance Company Stock, \$1,200—\$7,200. Deposited at 5 per cent. \$700, six months, \$1,850. Mortgages, \$13,900—\$564,00. Cash on hand, chiefly due missionaries, (Oct. 22d,) \$806,47; and collections, (Nov. 6th) \$115,64.

"The Treasurer observes, that the income has been diminished, by the failure of the Boston and American Banks to make a dividend in October last—but chiefly through the failure of a person, who has a large sum loaned him, on mortgage, by the former Treasurer, to pay the interest thereon for *four years*, amounting to \$1,080. Without intending to criminate the former Treasurer, it is but just to observe, that the security held for payment of some large sums was not sufficient, that the interest had not been received thereon; that the present Treasurer has given particular and efficient attention to the subject, and has taken care to obtain new and sufficient security."

It was also stated, in the notice referred to, that "all the missionaries appointed by the Society, with possibly one exception, were, *so far as we have been able to ascertain*, Orthodox, till since the death of its late President, the Hon. William Phillips, who left to it a legacy of \$5,000." Mr. Bradford doubts the correctness of this statement, and mentions the names of several, who have been employed by the Society, who, though they were not all "*Unitarians*, in the modern acceptation of the term," yet "were not of such theological opinions as to entitle them to the epithet of *Orthodox*, as usually understood."

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Suggestions respecting Improvements in Education*, presented to the Trustees of the Hartford Female Seminary, and published at their request. By CATHARINE E. BEECHER. Hartford: Packard and Butler. 1829. pp. 84.

This work is scarcely a proper subject of criticism, as it was intended primarily for the consideration of those to whom it was presented, and for the accomplishment of a mere local object. We recommend it, however, as deserving a wider circulation than that for which it was prepared, and as calculated to promote other important objects, besides that of enlarging the Female Seminary at Hartford. It is evidently the production of a vigorous mind—the result of much thought, and of a treasured experience in the difficult employment of school education. It seems to have been the plan of the writer to point out *defects* in the common systems of education, suggesting, as she passes along, appropriate remedies. The first of the defects here mentioned is,

"That the formation of the minds of children has not been made a *profession*, securing wealth, influence, and honor to those who enter it." The business of teaching has too often "been looked upon as the resource of poverty, or as a drudgery suited only to inferior minds," "and few have engaged in it, except those whose talents would not allow them to rise in other professions, or who have only made it a temporary resort, till better prospects should offer."

Other defects are, "the want of proper school books;" the habit "of committing to memory words, instead of acquiring ideas;" the "notion that the communication of knowledge," rather than stimulating the mind of the pupil to action, "is the primary and almost the sole object of instruction;" "the neglect of using objects of *sight* to aid in illustrating and communicating ideas;" that pupils have not been taught "to instruct others;" "that the public have no standard by which to test the character of schools;" and "that the great principle of the *division of labor* has never, until very recently, and only in a few instances, been introduced into school education."

"But," says Miss B., "the most important and most neglected department in education still remains unfilled and unsustained in all our seminaries. We have yet to learn what could be effected, were the cultivation of the social feelings, and the formation and correction of the moral character and habits, the distinct department of one person, who should by talents and experience be suitably qualified." "The writer holds that it ought to be a maxim in education, that *there is no defect in character, habits, or manners, but is susceptible of remedy.*"

With these views as to the importance of *moral* education, in distinction from intellectual, it was a leading purpose of the writer, in addressing the trustees of the seminary over which she presides, to induce them to furnish additional accommodations, that an assistant principal might be employed, and the moral cultivation of the pupils be made a direct and prominent object. Whether *all* will be accomplished in this department of education which our authoress represents as practicable, we think doubtful. That much, however, may be done, by strict attention, timely directions and encouragements, a proper example, and a well regulated government, towards forming the *character* for virtue and happiness, we have no doubt. We hope, at least, that the experiment may be tried. The prospect even of *partial* success is sufficiently animating, to compensate for any sacrifices or responsibilities that may be necessarily incurred.

2. *Strictures on the Review of Dr. Spring's Dissertation on the Means of Regeneration, in the Christian Spectator for 1829.* By BENNET TYLER, D. D., Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Portland, Me. Portland: Shirley and Hyde. 1829. pp. 64.

In the last volume of the *Christian Spectator* are several articles on "the Means of Regeneration," commenced as a review of Dr. Spring's Essay on that subject, but continued as an independent discussion. These articles—written, as all allow, with distinguished ability—have been read with a variety of emotions by different individuals;—by some, with great satisfaction; by others, with equal dissatisfaction; and by others, with a degree of hesitation and embarrassment. Dr. Tyler is one of those who are *dissatisfied* with the discussion in the *Spectator*, and the object of the work before us is to make the public acquainted with the grounds of his dissatisfaction. After several preliminary remarks on the use of terms, the hypothesis of the reviewer in the *Spectator* is stated, as follows, viz.

"That antecedent to regeneration," (in what the reviewer calls the restricted sense,) "there is a suspension of the selfish principle in the sinner's heart; that certain acts are then performed by him, which are not dictated by selfishness, but by *self-love*; and that these constitute *using the means of regeneration.*"

Respecting this hypothesis, Dr. T. suggests the following queries: 1. Whether it does not make regeneration "a gradual and progressive work;" 2. Whether it "does not involve the inconsistency of supposing that the heart is changed, antecedent to regeneration;"

3. Whether, on this ground, the sinner, "while using the means of regeneration," can feel any "conviction of sin;" 4. "Whether the scheme of the reviewer does not dispense with the necessity of divine influence in regeneration;" 5. Whether it "does not represent the sinner as laboring under a natural inability to do his duty;" 6. Whether it is not inconsistent with "the doctrine of sovereign, distinguishing grace;" and 7. Whether, "if drawn out in detail, and inculcated by the teachers of religion," it "has not a direct tendency to stifle conviction of sin, and produce spurious conversions."—It would be impossible, in this brief notice, to give our readers so much as the plan of the work before us. It is written throughout with great clearness and candor, and should be read, if possible, by all who have read the articles in the *Spectator*. It does not become us, at this stage of the discussion, to attempt deciding any seeming differences betwixt our brethren. We presume the reviewer will think that he has been misunderstood, and of course that he has not been justly represented; and, as Dr. Tyler observes, should the effect of the *Strictures* be to "call forth from him explanations, satisfactory to the minds of his ministerial brethren, no unimportant object will be gained." If the discussion is to be continued, we hardly need express the hope that all concerned will endeavor to be explicit, treat one another as brethren, and set an example of affectionate inquiry after truth, instead of an impetuous struggle for victory.—At the close of the work before us, the author has summed up, in several propositions, what he considers as essential to the doctrine of regeneration; and we presume that most of his Orthodox brethren, without excepting the conductors of the *Christian Spectator*, will cordially assent to the statement he has given:

- "1. Man is a moral agent, and capable of obeying every divine command.
- "2. He is a rebel against God, and loves his rebellion.
- "3. God commands him immediately to repent and return to his allegiance.
- "4. He is able to repent, if he will. The duty is easy and reasonable. But he will not repent, but resists every motive that is presented to his mind. Consequently,
- "5. *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.*

6. *A Dictionary of important Names, Objects, and Terms, found in the Holy Scriptures.* Intended principally for youth. By HOWARD MALCOM, A. M. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands. 1830.

This will be found an interesting and useful volume, to parents, to Sabbath School teachers, to all who wish either to understand the Scriptures themselves, or to impart a knowledge of them to others. It is not, indeed, a complete dictionary of the Bible—far from it; but it includes most of those names and objects mentioned in the Bible, respecting which instruction is felt to be needed by the youthful reader. The explanations of terms denoting doctrines are decidedly evangelical, and the work is calculated, in this respect, to leave a good impression. We were particularly pleased with the explanation of the term *Sabbath*, in which the perpetuity of the

institution, notwithstanding the change in the day of its observance, is briefly but satisfactorily maintained. Were we to take any exception, it would be to the positiveness with which certain small matters, usually considered as doubtful, such as the questions respecting the reality of witchcraft, the immolation of Jephthah's daughter, &c., are determined. As a specimen of the work, we quote the explanation of the term, *raiment*.

"Raiment was at first made of the skins of beasts, but the art of spinning and weaving was soon invented, and embroidering became common in the days of the Judges. The most common garment in the days of Christ, was a sort of shirt or tunick, reaching to the ancles generally, with sleeves, but sometimes having only armholes. A girdle confined it at the waist. Over this, were worn various garments, according to the quality of the person. All classes wore something in the form of a large shawl, called a *cloak* or *upper garment*, Matt. xxi. 8. When a person had nothing on but the tunick, he was said to be naked. John xxi. 7. Persons could carry various articles in the folds of their shawls, Luke vi. 38, and at night, in that climate, they rarely needed any other bed-clothes, Ex. xxii. 28. Round this outer garment the ancient Jews were accustomed to have a border or fringe, sometimes marked with texts of Scriptures. The Pharisees, through ostentation, made theirs remarkably large, Matt. xxiii. 5. When engaged in laborious work, this outer garment was laid aside, as our Saviour did, when he washed his disciples' feet, John xiii. 4, and Peter, when he fished, John xxi. 7. This explains, also, Matt. xxiv. 18. These upper garments would of course fit persons of any size, equally well. To give raiment, was therefore common; and especially, when opulent or eminent men gave rich entertainments. In such cases, not to accept and put on the proffered robe, was a great affront, Matt. xxii. 12.

4. *A Sermon delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Asa Hixon, at Oakham, October 7, 1829.* By JACOB IDE, Pastor of the Second Church in Medway. Brookfield: E. and G. Merriam. 1829. pp. 36.

This ingenious and excellent discourse is founded on Ex. xvi. 8. '*And what are we? Your murmurings are not against us, but against the LORD.*' The object of the preacher is to show that "*those who murmur against the servants of God, in the faithful discharge of their duty, murmur against God himself.*"

"There is much murmuring against faithful ministers of the Gospel, because they believe and preach the doctrines" of "*depravity*," of "*regeneration*," of the "*Trinity*," of "*God's eternal purposes*," and "*the future punishment of the wicked.*"—But they preach these doctrines not at all more frequently or *plainly* than they are taught in the word of God.

"What Trinitarian did you ever hear assert the divinity of Christ in plainer terms than those of John? 'In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word *was* God,' 'This is the *true* God, and eternal life.' Or than those of Paul, 'Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, *God* blessed forever.' I insist upon it, this is as plain, and as strong language, as any body uses on this subject; and if this is not to be understood as asserting the proper divinity of Christ, we are not bound to consider the language of any one as asserting it. I know it will be said that this may be explained so as to bear another meaning. So may the language of any Trinitarian whatever be explained, so as to bear a meaning which he never intended to express. But the question is, not what meaning may be *put* upon a man's words; it is rather what meaning do they most obviously convey."

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

MARCH, 1830.

NO. 3.

COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF
UNITARIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. VI.

DEAR SIR,

MY original purpose in these letters, though unavoidably delayed for several months, has not been forgotten. I propose now to resume the subject, and to finish what I have to offer, in as little time and space as circumstances will permit. When Unitarianism had gained footing among us, in the manner already pointed out, its growth and prevalence were greatly promoted by *concealment*. It is obvious that concealment, if successfully practised, must have essentially aided the progress of Unitarianism; as by this means excitement would be prevented, suspicion avoided, and the deluded churches would receive those as pastors, and ministers (in their ignorance) embrace those as brethren, whom otherwise they would have rejected. The poison would in this way be taken without alarm, and the infection spread through the religious community, before apprehension should be excited, or the friends of truth were apprised of their danger. That such would be the tendency and effects of concealment, is too obvious to need explanation. In what follows, therefore, I shall produce the evidence that this tendency was duly appreciated by the early Unitarians of Massachusetts, and that, *until the controversy in 1815, a studied, and, to some extent, a successful concealment was practised*.

It should be observed, however, that in this respect the Unitarians of Massachusetts have not been singular. It is mentioned by one apostle as a characteristic trait of 'damnable heresies,' that they shall be brought in '*privily*' (2 Pet. ii. 1.); and by

another, that those who 'deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ,' are wont to '*creep in unawares.*' (Jude 4.) Unitarianism, whatever may be its character in other respects, will be found uniformly to have borne these marks of error. Wherever introduced, it has been brought in '*privily*'—has '*crept in unawares.*'

In this manner it was introduced and propagated by the *ancient* Unitarians. Irenæus describes them as "using *alluring discourses in public*, because of the common Christians;" as "pretending to *preach like us*" (the Orthodox;) and as "complaining that, though *their doctrine be the same as ours*, we abstain from their communion, and call them heretics." But he adds, "When they (Unitarians) have seduced any from the faith by their disputes, and made them willing to comply with them, *then they begin to open their mysteries.*"*

When Paul of Samosata, a Unitarian of the third century, was "charged with holding certain opinions which he had preached, he *solemnly denied the charge*, nay, *denied it on oath*. Yet, in a little while, he preached the same doctrines again, and was again charged, and again found to *deny and equivocate*;" until, at length, his true character was exposed, and he was excluded from the sacred office.*

Arius, the father of the Arians, a short time before his death, was summoned to the Imperial palace, and asked whether he agreed to the Nicene faith. He without hesitation answered in the affirmative. The creed was then offered him, which he readily subscribed; and when, to remove all doubt, the emperor required him to swear that he believed *as he had written*, he solemnly *swore that he did*. At the time of this oath, (as Socrates, a cotemporary historian, intimates,†) Arius had concealed under one of his arms a paper, on which he had *just written* his real sentiments; and the meaning of the oath, according to his intention, was, that he believed *as he had written* on this secreted paper!!

The elder Socinus, after his settlement at Zurich, "adopted the Helvetic confession of faith, and professed himself a member of the church of Switzerland." He was "artful in *concealing* his wayward opinions," broaching them sometimes "under the form of questions to be discussed," and sometimes in private letters to those "whose judgement he respected, and in whose friendship he could confide." His nephew, Faustus Socinus, who inherited his papers, and propagated the system which he had matured, resorted to the most unworthy arts (if historians are to

* See Miller's Letters on Unitarianism, pp. 238, 239.

† Lib. i. cap. 38. See also Milner, vol. ii. p. 72.

be believed) in order "to *conceal*, or to *varnish over*, the most offensive features of his system."*

The German Unitarians, in the beginning of their career, were careful to disguise and conceal their sentiments. Their publications were, for the most part, "equivocal and deceitful." "In various instances," we are told, "it was not only difficult, but absolutely impossible, fairly to unmask the author, and to convict him of unchristian sentiments; so well he knew how to *hide himself under a show of piety and orthodoxy*."†

And Unitarianism in England, boldly as it is maintained at present, was by many, for a long time, studiously concealed. Whiston, speaking of himself and Emlyn in 1724, says, "We have had some few, and but a very few followers here; while almost all those who are privately of our judgement, *temporize*, or *prevaricate*, or use *political management*, to avoid persecution, or the loss of preferment."‡ Dr. Clarke strangely equivocated, when his work on the Trinity was brought before Convocation; and whether he was more properly a Trinitarian, Unitarian, or neither, is to this day uncertain.§ Messrs. Peirce and Hallet, the first promoters of Arianism among the English Dissenters, long after suspicions were excited against them, *denied expressly* that they were Arians or had "taught *anything like Arianism*."|| It is said of the early English Unitarians generally, in the History of Dissenters, that their opinions were "cautiously *concealed*;" and Dr. Priestley is spoken of as among the first, who, "scorning the *crafty concealment* and *cunning equivocation* of his predecessors, frankly told the world his creed."¶ Dr. Priestley himself "declared that there were *great numbers* in England, even among the clergy, who, while they *privately* held Unitarian opinions, did not scruple, *in public*, to countenance a mode of worship which they would not deny to be, according to their own principles, *idolatrous and blasphemous*."**—And Mr. Belsham avers, that "there are thousands" of Unitarians in England, who "are deterred by *secular considerations*, and the harsh spirit of the times, from avowing their real principles."††

It will be seen in what follows, that American Unitarianism has proved itself a shoot of the old stock, and that the same concealment which, at different periods, has been practised so successfully on the other continent, has been attempted and practised here.

1. In the first place, a variety of *facts* may be mentioned, indicating the existence of such a practice.—It was this, undoubtedly,

* Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 469. Waterman's Life of Calvin, p. 61. Miller's Letters, p. 240.

† Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. p. 58.

‡ Memoirs, vol. i. p. 312.

§ See Biographia Britannica, vol. iii. p. 602.

|| See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. ii. p. 587.

¶ *ibid*, pp. 671, 673.

** Miller's Letters, p. 241.

†† Review of Wilberforce, p. 227.

which occasioned the violent opposition to public formularies of faith, which commenced here more than thirty years ago. This opposition was disguised under a show of zeal for religious freedom, and for what were called the first principles of Protestantism; but the true ground of it, undeniably, was, the *character* of the existing confessions, and the wish to propagate an opposing system without discovery or alarm.

In pursuance of the same policy, an opposition was early excited against the examination of candidates for the Gospel ministry. Nothing surely can be more reasonable in itself than that candidates for the sacred office should be *examined*, as to their fitness for the great work on which they propose to enter. Even the teacher of a common school must be examined, before he can lawfully instruct our children in the first rudiments of knowledge; and is it of less importance that the views and qualifications of those should be ascertained, who are to enter the sacred desk, and be recognized as "stewards of the mysteries of God"? "The fathers of New England," says Dr. Trumbull, "were *exceedingly strict* with respect to those whom they ordained, *examining them*, not only in doctrinal points of theology, with respect to cases of conscience, and their ability to defend Christianity and its doctrines, but with respect to *their own experimental and heart religion*."* But near the commencement of the existing defection, the minds of many underwent a change on this subject, and in their zeal for religious freedom and the rights of conscience, the ancient examinations were denounced, "as a destructive evil."† It was foreseen, as it must have been, that in the ordinary course of examining candidates, Unitarians would certainly be ensnared and detected, and that when detected, they would not be ordained.

If Unitarianism, in its early stages, was not intentionally concealed, why did not those who embraced it assume the *name* which is now so dear to them? That this was not to any considerable extent done, is matter of unquestionable notoriety. There were Arminians, in distinction from Calvinists; and there were those calling themselves *liberal* or *catholic* Christians, who believed that every thing essential to the Christian faith might be comprehended "in one bright line, 'Jesus is the Christ,'"—in distinction from others who held to the primitive faith of the New England churches; but, previous to the controversy in 1815, there were few, if any, acknowledged Unitarians. The name was unappropriated and almost unknown. It was sometimes charged upon the liberal party by the Orthodox, but the charge was resisted as false and slanderous. But why such an extreme aversion to

* Hist. of Connecticut, vol. i. p. 313.

† See Panoplist for April 1806.

this name? It is a cherished, boasted name now; why such a dread of it in former years?

Again; if Unitarianism for a time was not studiously concealed, why was it not fully and plainly preached? Why did not ministers inform their hearers that they disbelieved the Divinity and atonement of Christ, and had embraced a different system of religion from that which their fathers had inculcated? That the peculiarities of Unitarianism were not preached, previous to the controversy in 1815, is on all hands admitted. "We seldom or *never* introduce the Trinitarian controversy into our pulpits." "We have *never* entered into discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity."* "They *touched not disputed doctrines*."† But why were not Unitarian doctrines preached before 1815, as well as since? If these doctrines are true now, they were then. If they are important now, they were then. If they are denied and assailed now, so were they then. If they now constitute a part of that "counsel of God," the whole of which every minister is bound to declare to his people; so did they then. What reason shall be assigned, therefore, for the reserve formerly manifested in respect to these doctrines, except that they were then new and unpopular, their abettors were afraid to preach them, and chose not to hazard their places and influence by disclosing their views.‡

If Unitarianism was not concealed, up to the time specified in these remarks, why was it not *openly* inculcated and defended from the press? The press was indeed enlisted, strongly enlisted, for its inculcation and defence, but not in a way which made any particular individual responsible. Foreign Unitarian works were republished and industriously circulated; but no one was known in the transaction except the bookseller, and with him it passed before the public as a matter of enterprise and speculation. Unitarianism, too, was sometimes advocated in periodicals; but the articles in support of it were uniformly anonymous, and the authors of them were generally unknown. It is, then, a fact, that, up to the time of the controversy in 1815, Unitarianism, in this country, was not *openly* inculcated from the press. Up to that time, *not one* of those who constituted the bone and muscle of the Unitarian party in Massachusetts ever appeared before the public, under his own proper name, in its defence. For this

* See Channing's Letter to Thatcher, pp. 13—16.

† Unitarian Advocate for April, 1828.

‡ In the Vermont Adviser for 1815, we are told of "a preacher of the Boston school settled in that part of the country. Respecting his opinions," says the Editor, "there was formerly no little controversy, and *whether his congregation have, to this day, found out what his sentiments are*, we are by no means sure. It was staunchly contended by him that he *was not bound to disclose his principles*, and that all the profession of faith which he ought to be required to make was, that he believed the truth of the Christian religion. We have very satisfactory evidence that, in his *endeavors at disguising his tenets*, he has on some occasions been guilty, if of nothing worse, of pretty gross *equivocation*." vol. vii. p. 240.

remarkable fact, what good reason can be assigned? Since the period so often referred to, scores of writers have come forward under their own names, and appeared as advocates of the "new doctrine." But why this surprising change in the mode of operation, except that a studied concealment had been previously practised, which then, by an unwelcome *disclosure*, was suddenly broken up?

If there was no intentional concealment, up to this time, why, I ask, was the *work, making the disclosure here referred to*, so long secreted after its arrival in this country? This work, as is generally known, is the *Memoirs of Lindsey* by Mr. Belsham—from which was extracted the pamphlet afterwards reviewed in the *Panoplist*, entitled "A brief history of the progress and present state of the Unitarian churches in America." The *Memoirs of Lindsey* were published in London in 1812, were probably received in Boston shortly afterwards, but were unseen and unknown, except by a few select individuals, until the beginning of 1815. The motive for suppressing this work was well understood by the editor of the pamphlet extracted from it. "The care," says he, "which has been manifested to limit the knowledge of this interesting work, during many months, probably two years, since its arrival in Boston, indicates pretty plainly the *unwillingness of those who have possessed copies of it to have its contents generally known.*" p. 4. The same account of the matter is given by a reviewer of this pamphlet (a Unitarian) in the *Boston Patriot* for May 13, 1815. "It is a fact," says this reviewer, "that the work (*Memoirs of Lindsey*) no sooner arrived here, than it was *studiously concealed*. But a few copies were received, and the circulation of these was confined to *a small number of select individuals*. On a careful perusal, we can find but one motive for this suppression, viz. that the *Unitarians*, who are principally confined to Boston and its vicinity, *are not yet prepared for an open and explicit avowal of their sentiments.*" Thus reasoned a political writer, a Unitarian, in 1815; and to the same conclusion must every candid mind be brought, when made acquainted with the facts.

It was shown in my last, that the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College and the late President both obtained their places by concealment. When Dr. Ware was elected, the suggestion that he was an Arian was strenuously resisted, and represented as "a calumny." And says a Unitarian clergyman, who had the best means of knowing, "Had Dr. Kirkland been an acknowledged defender of Unitarianism," at the time of his elevation to the Presidency, "*he would not have been elected to that place.*"*—It should be added in this connection, that most of

* See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. ii. pp. 471, 477.

the present Unitarian clergy, who were settled previous to 1815, obtained their places by a like concealment. What I mean is, they did not go to their parishes as Unitarians, or disclose to their people, previous to settlement, their Unitarian principles; and if they had disclosed them, in all probability they would not have been settled. Of the first part of this proposition, there can be no doubt. To call names in support of it might appear invidious, and is unnecessary. I aver, therefore, in the general, and I challenge contradiction, if what I say is not the truth, that there is not now a Congregational Unitarian minister in Massachusetts, settled previous to 1815, who went to his people in the name and with the character of a Unitarian, and plainly preached to them, before ordination, the peculiarities of Unitarianism; and I do not believe there is one, who, had he done this, could have been settled without difficulty, if at all.*

I have here called your attention to various undeniable *facts*, all conspiring to establish the point at issue, viz. that *previous to the controversy in 1815, there was, on the part of Unitarians in this region, a studied concealment of their religious opinions*. I do not mean that these opinions were *entirely* concealed. Doubtless, those holding them were wont to express them—to use the language of Mr. Wells—‘*when they judged it proper*.’ But they did not judge it proper to express them from the pulpit, or (with their names) from the press, or in any other place or manner where their expressions would be likely to be quoted in proof of their being Unitarians.†

2. The conduct of Unitarians was such, in former years, as *made the impression on those around them* that they were intending and endeavoring to conceal their sentiments. In his first letter

* Many persons now living recollect what took place at the time when the late Mr. Buckminster received his call to become minister of the Brattle-street church and society in Boston. When the proposal was made to give him a call, Mr. Cooper, a venerable member of the church, and son of one of the former ministers, rose and objected, on the ground that Mr. B. did not believe the divinity of Christ. To this it was replied, that Mr. Cooper must be mistaken; that, though Mr. B. might not have been so explicit on that point as some desired, it was not to be doubted that he believed so important a doctrine as the divinity of the Saviour. Mr. Cooper, however, insisted, that he had taken pains to satisfy himself of the truth of what he had stated, and that he was not mistaken. On this, a wish was expressed by a third person that Mr. Cooper might leave the meeting, as the society would undoubtedly give Mr. B. a call, and it was very desirable that they should be unanimous. This suggestion, however, was not followed or approved; Mr. Cooper was suffered to remain; but it was under these circumstances that the call was given.

† Though the cloak of concealment was in a good measure torn off by the controversy of 1815, still, there has not been all that explicitness since which ought to have been expected. Several improvements in theology (so called) which now begin to be disclosed, have long been concealed; and more, doubtless, are still concealed, to be published in due time. As an indication of this, allow me to advert to a single fact. Why is it that the lectures at the theological school at Cambridge have always been considered as *private* lectures? Why is it that the students have not been *expected*, if they have been permitted, to reciprocate the civilities shown them at other seminaries, by inviting their friends, and especially the students of other seminaries, to go with them to the lecture room?

to Dr. Channing, Dr. Worcester says, "The opinion is very extensively prevalent," "that liberal ministers, and other liberal gentlemen have judged it proper *not* to make ordinarily a free and full disclosure of their sentiments; that they have, in fact, thought it expedient *to temporize*. *Hundreds and hundreds of times have I heard it uttered from various quarters, and with various expressions of approbation and disapprobation; and never, in any debate or conversation, as I recollect, have I heard the truth of it denied, or called in question.* It seems, indeed, to have been received as an *established, uncontested fact*, that ministers of the liberal class were *not* accustomed to be unreserved and explicit in the public avowal and declaration of their sentiments. I confess to you, sir, that I had so received it, nor did I ever imagine that in so receiving it, there was anything injurious or uncharitable; for I did suppose that you and your liberal brethren held it as a *maxim*, founded upon reasons satisfactory to your own minds, that a degree of reserve and concealment, greater or less according to circumstances, was prudent, and justifiable, and praiseworthy." p. 17.

The same impression was made on the editor of the History of American Unitarianism, the pamphlet extracted from the Memoirs of Lindsey. "Those," says he, "who have been chiefly concerned in conducting these operations," introducing and promoting Unitarianism, "have deemed it expedient, till this stage of the process, *to conceal from the mass of the Christian community their ultimate designs.*" p. 4:

A similar impression was made on the conductors of the Pano-plist—men favored with the best opportunities of observing and judging for themselves. They speak of "the work of error" as having been "carried on for the most part *in secret*"—as having silently and *covertly* extended itself." The advocates of Socinianism in general have *not dared to be open*," but "have *clandestinely crept into Orthodox churches.*" vol. xi. pp. 241, 260.

The same opinion is expressed by the editor of the Vermont Adviser. "These ministers (the Unitarians) have all along *carefully refrained from an explicit avowal of their actual belief*. They have rather pretended that they did not essentially vary from the generally received opinions," and their "efforts to propagate Unitarianism have been made" in an "*insidious and covert manner.*" vol. vii. pp. 228, 239.

The reviewer in the Patriot, already quoted, who could have been impelled by no religious antipathies, is still more full in expressing the same sentiment. "*Why*," he asks, "do not the" (Unitarian) "*clergy openly profess and teach the tenets of their belief?*" "We may feel pretty sure that it does not spring from any particular objection to controversy;" "nor from any peculiar and unusual delicacy to the feelings of an opposite party. We think

we may safely infer so much, from the fact, that political questions are discussed with great freedom, and with quite as liberal a use of the vituperation style, as comports with the decency and moderation expected from the pulpit."

3. The conduct of American Unitarians was formerly such, as to give occasion to Mr. Belsham to reproach them with "a mean and temporizing policy," and to represent them as unwilling to disclose their sentiments. Speaking of the Result of the Council by which Mr. Abbot, of Coventry, (Conn.) was dismissed, he says, "Thus, again we see the sacred cause of Christian truth sacrificed to a *mean and temporizing policy*, and the faithful champion of truth, the amiable, useful and beloved pastor, torn from his weeping flock and consigned to poverty and solitude, for the sake of preserving a *hollow, deceitful*, temporary peace."* In another place, under the semblance of an apology for the Boston clergy, he exposes the concealment they were practising in the following terms: "Can it, upon the common principles of human nature, be reasonably expected of a body of clergy, nursed in the lap of ease and affluence, and placed in a station of such high secular consideration and comfort as that of the ministers of Boston, that they should come forward, and by an OPEN PROFESSION OF UNPOPULAR TRUTH, *voluntarily risk the loss of all their temporal dignity and comfort*, and incur the contempt and enmity of many who are now their warmest admirers and friends?" "Who will venture to say of himself, that his virtue would be equal to the trial? Yet still, it cannot be reasonably hoped that truth will make any visible and rapid progress, till her advocates rise above *the fear of man*, and *the love of ease*, and are willing, with the Apostles of Christ and the reformers of every age, to forsake all, and to sacrifice their dearest interests in her glorious cause."†

4. In proof of the concealment formerly practised by Unitarians in this country, we have the testimony of numbers from among themselves.—Dr. Worcester speaks of an ordination which he attended in Boston, where "the preacher (a Unitarian) very distinctly, and with considerable amplification, held forth, that though in some places it might be well, and contribute to the faith and virtue of a people, for a minister *openly and plainly to declare his sentiments*, yet in other places *it would not be prudent or proper*."‡ And we are told of another ordination, at which an aged Unitarian minister, in the charge to his young brother, took occasion to congratulate him "on the favorableness of existing circumstances

* Hist. of Am. Un. p. 33. The Committee who prepared the Result of this Council were the Rev. Doctors Lathrop of Poston, Reed of Bridgewater, Porter of Roxbury, Bancroft of Worcester, and Thayer of Lancaster.

† Hist. of Am. Unitarianism, p. 41.

‡ First Letter to Channing, p. 18.

compared with those of former years. 'The time has been,' said he, 'when our peculiar sentiments were so unpopular that it was hazardous to teach them. The minds of men were not prepared to receive them. We were obliged to *conceal them from public view, or disclose them in ambiguous language.*'"*

Dr. Freeman, in a letter to Mr. Lindsey, written in 1796 or 1797, speaks of certain "*cautious*" ministers, "who content themselves with leading their hearers, by a course of rational but prudent sermons, gradually and *insensibly* to embrace" Unitarianism.†

William Wells, Esq. writing to Mr. Belsham in 1812, says, "With regard to the progress of Unitarianism, I have but little to say. Its tenets have spread very extensively in New-England, but I believe there is *only one church* PROFESSEDLY Unitarian."†

A Unitarian minister at Philadelphia, in 1811, speaks of eight Congregational ministers in Boston who "are anti-Calvinistic and *anti-Trinitarian*;" and yet he says, "there is *only one* place of worship at Boston which is *avowedly* Unitarian;"—of course, the Unitarianism of *all but one* was disguised or concealed. The same writer, the next year, repeats the assertion, that "with the exception of Dr. Freeman's church, *no place of worship at Boston is avowedly Unitarian.*"‡

The Rev. Francis Parkman, speaking of the Boston Association of Ministers in 1812, says, "Of these gentlemen, about twenty in number, there is *only one* whom, from anything I ever heard him offer, either *in private*, or *in his pulpit*, I or anybody else, would have a right to call an Unitarian. Even this gentleman, when I was in Boston, did not preach Unitarianism systematically. *I never heard him express such views of the person of Christ*, and it was rather from inference that I could say he held them." Of Dr. Freeman, the same writer says, "I never heard him express an Unitarian sentiment, and I believe *he carefully avoids it in the pulpit, because it might unnecessarily disturb some of his hearers.*—There is now one more gentleman in Boston who, *with his intimate friends*, may perhaps be considered a Unitarian; but **HE MAINTAINS THE SAME CAUTIOUS RESERVE**; and from neither his *sermons*, his *prayers*, nor his **PRIVATE CONVERSATION**, could I infer that he was a Unitarian.—Now even admitting, what I hardly think I have a right to do, that these three gentlemen are Unitarians, to what can all this *prudent reserve* be ascribed, but to their conviction that the preaching of Unitarian doctrines would be *offensive to their hearers, and injurious to their usefulness?*"||

But, a "little time has elapsed," says a writer in the Christian

* Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. ii. p. 6. † Hist. of Am. Unitarianism, pp. 22, 43, 44

‡ Monthly Repository, vol. vii. pp. 56, 649.

|| Monthly Repository, vol. vii. p. 199.

Examiner, "since an objection to the chief doctrines of Orthodoxy *could not be whispered safely.*" "I can remember the time, and I am not old, when, though Boston was *full of Unitarian sentiment and feeling, there was NO OPEN PROFESSION OF IT.*" (Consequently all must have been concealed.) "*A dead silence was maintained in the pulpit on doctrinal subjects; a silence which was not disturbed by the press.*" vol. iii. pp. 113, 114.

5. It should be added, that Unitarians, previous to 1815, not only did not avow their sentiments, they endeavored to keep up the impression that they *were not Unitarians*; that they did not differ materially from the Orthodox; and when the charge of Unitarianism was preferred against them, they resented it as a *slander*. In proof of these strong assertions, I appeal, first, to the publications of the Orthodox in those times. The editor of the History of American Unitarianism urges as a reason for making that publication, "*Many complaints have been made that the Boston clergy have been slanderously reported to be Unitarians.* This pamphlet will show who are their 'slanderers,' if indeed they are entitled to this character, and exculpate some who have been falsely accused in this thing." p. 5. The conductors of the Panoplist represent it as "an artifice practised *systematically*," by Unitarian clergymen, "to inculcate the opinion that *they did not differ materially* from their clerical brethren through the country. This artifice has been carried so far as to induce them to *complain in bitter terms, that they were slandered by our work*, when represented as thus differing, and as promoting the circulation of Socinian books."* "They have complained that they were not invited to preach, when travelling through the country, and have imputed this neglect to the effect of *slander.*" vol. xi. p. 242.

The Vermont Adviser too says, that when "the clergy of Boston have" been represented "as having departed widely from the true doctrines of the Gospel, and verged far towards Socinianism," such charges "have *uniformly and boldly been pronounced the offspring of misrepresentation and calumny.*" vol. vii. p. 223. The testimony of Dr. Miller is equally explicit. "Charges" of Unitarianism "were frequently made; but by most of the" Unitarians "repelled, as unkind and even *slanderous*. They appeared anxious to have it believed that they did not differ materially from the Orthodox around them." Letters, p. 242.

But in proof of the point now under consideration, I do not rely exclusively on the testimony of the Orthodox. The leading Unitarians of their time uniformly considered themselves as *slandered*, when charged with Unitarianism. In a review of Dr. Porter's convention sermon in 1810,† and referring to a previous review of

* When the conductors of the Panoplist "charged the liberal party with having patronised and circulated the Improved Version" of the New Testament, "the charge was *very angrily rebelled.*" vol. xii. 205.

† Dr. Porter of Roxbury.

the same in the Panoplist, they say, "among other flowers of rhetoric, we are charged with UNITARIANISM, misrepresentation, dishonesty, resemblance to the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees, and enmity to every thing which constitutes the peculiar glory of our forefathers." Did not these gentlemen mean to be understood here, that they were as far from "Unitarianism," as they were from "misrepresentation, dishonesty, or a resemblance to the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees?" In other words, did they not mean to be understood that they *were not Unitarians*? In the same article they say, "on what authority they (the conductors of the Panoplist) imply that Dr. Porter is a Socinian, in *any sense*, we know not." "There is nothing in the great principle for which he contends which has *the slightest reference to Unitarianism*." "With regard to the numerous charges of latitudinarianism, *Unitarianism*, &c., Dr. Porter may reply in the eloquent language of Bishop Watson, 'What! shall the church of Christ never be freed from the narrow minded contentions of bigots; from the insults of men who know not what manner of spirit they are of?'" It was then an "insult" to Dr. Porter, in 1810, to call him an Unitarian.

But I must hasten to a close. If any inquire, 'Why bring up these old affairs? They have passed out of mind—and why not let them rest, and be forgotten?' I answer, in the first place, that these things ought not to be forgotten. They are worthy to be recorded and transmitted to future generations, as a memorial of the manner in which not a few of the ancient churches of Massachusetts have been corrupted and undermined. But, in the second place, the facts here published are an instructive comment on the boasted *tendencies* of the Unitarian system. Much has been said and written in praise of this system, as tending to invigorate conscience, quicken our moral sensibilities, and lead to the purest practical results. With these results, or with a portion of them, the public have here the means of becoming acquainted. We have seen that Unitarianism, not only in this country, but *wherever planted*, has been, in a greater or less degree, (according as temptations have prevailed more or less) disguised and secreted from public view. Or as stated by Dr. Miller, "In all ages, from the time of Ebion to the present hour, where the mass of the surrounding population was Orthodox, Unitarians have manifested a disposition to *conceal their sentiments, to equivocate, to evade, and even solemnly to deny them when questioned, and to disguise themselves under the garb of Orthodoxy*, to a degree which no other sect calling itself Christian ever manifested. To what, I ask, is this fact to be ascribed? I leave it with you, Christian brethren, to solve the question. I will only say, that I can think of no possible reason for it, but such as must stamp the character of deep corruption upon the Unitarian cause." Letters, p. 245.

Another reason for this publication is, that individuals and churches may be on their guard against new impositions. By the controversy of 1815, Unitarianism, in some of its leading characteristics, was brought to light; and by dint of discussion since, farther disclosures have occasionally been made. We have been told that Christ is no more than a man; that the Scriptures are not the word of God; that the Sabbath is not of divine institution; that the Old Testament ought to be rejected; that it is doubtful whether there is any soul separate from the body; that there is no devil; and no eternal punishment for the wicked.* How much further this acknowledged reformation has in private proceeded, to be unfolded in due time, does not as yet appear. But if, with all the light that is now before the public, any are again duped and ensnared, it must be their own fault.

It would also be a sufficient reason, were there no other, for publishing the facts here stated, that *they belong necessarily to my subject*. I am writing "Letters on the Introduction and Progress of Unitarianism in New-England." I am endeavoring to exhibit the *means* by which the error was introduced and has prevailed among us. One of these means, and a principal one, was the *concealment* formerly practised by those who had embraced the doctrine. But to have asserted this concealment, without proving it, would have availed nothing. It was necessary that the evidence should be exhibited. Especially is this necessary, since, in the teeth of all evidence, the fact in question is pertinaciously denied. It was denied by Dr. Channing in his letter to Mr. Thatcher. It has since been denied, perhaps in all the Unitarian periodicals. "The charge," we are told, "is *utterly false*. *There was no such concealment*."* It has been denied, or declared never to have been proved, by Rev. Mr. Parkman†—the same gentleman who, in 1812, testified to the "cautious reserve" practised by Unitarians in Boston:—While Unitarians persist in denying the charge of concealment, the proof of it ought certainly to be exhibited. And if they do not wish to see this proof repeated, with painful additions, and more widely circulated, then let them be willing to acknowledge the truth.

INVESTIGATOR.

* I would not be understood to assert that *all* Unitarians have expressed these sentiments, or that *all* approve them; but they have been expressed by leading individuals, who are supported and applauded in the course they have taken.

† Unitarian Advocate for April, 1828. ‡ In the Christian Register for April 18, 1829.

ON THE HOPE OF FUTURE REPENTANCE.

From the Letter of a Father to his Son.

I infer from your last, that, like most persons who have been religiously educated, you are not living altogether without hope ; but the hope you express, instead of comforting me on your behalf, has led to the most painful apprehensions. For what is your hope ? Not that you are at present interested in the promises of life, but that *hereafter you may be*. Or, to adopt your own phrase, “ I hope my heart is not fatally hardened, but that I shall yet come to repentance, and the enjoyment of religion.”

You doubtless intended I should infer from this, as I do, that you believe religion an important reality, and yourself a sinner in need of its consolations ; for if you did not believe as much as this, you would not *hope to possess religion*, or think of *delaying* it ; you would banish it from your thoughts at once and forever. But, my dear child, if religion is an important reality ; then why delay it at all ? For what can you be justified in delaying it ? As has been well observed, “ If religion is anything, it is everything.” If it is of any importance, it is of the utmost importance. If it will ever deserve your most earnest attention, does it not deserve it now ?

Besides, it should be remembered, that your conclusion to delay religion is a deliberate conclusion to *persist in sin*. If you purpose to delay religion another year, you thereby purpose, through another whole year, to be a rebel. You purpose to offend the God who made you, to resist the hand that supports you, to abuse mercies, pervert blessings, to tread under foot the Son of God, and grieve the Holy Spirit, and violate all the obligations under which Heaven has laid you—another year. Will your heart suffer you to form such a purpose ? And yet you cannot conclude to delay religion without forming it.

But what is it that *encourages* you to form the mad conclusion to delay ? Is it not this,—you believe that God is good, and will *bear with you*, if you do offend him ? If you did not believe this, you certainly would not dare to offend. If you believed he would come out in wrath against you, and strike you dead for your next offence, you would tremble at the thought of ever sinning again. But is it right to take encouragement in sin, from the consideration that God is *good* ? Can you consent to harden yourself in opposition to your heavenly Father by the very consideration which, more than any other, should melt you into gratitude and love ?

But to come more directly to your *hope*, in the terms in which you have expressed it.—“ You hope your heart is not fatally hardened, but that you shall yet come to repentance.” Now what is it, my child, to come to repentance ? What is it to repent of a

course of sin? It is doubtless to be heartily sorry for it. It is to hate and detest it. It is to mourn, and lament, and be in bitterness, on account of it. Your hope, therefore, comes to this ;—you are doing that now, and choose to do it, which you *hope* you shall be heartily sorry for at some future day ! You are loving, pursuing, and persisting in a course, for which you *hope* you shall mourn, and lament, and be bathed in tears of sorrow, before you die ! Just look at this, my son, and tell me, if a hope so strange, so preposterous, was ever deliberately indulged in regard to any other subject. What would you think of a person, who was pursuing a particular kind of business, and for the present was resolved to pursue it, which he really *hoped* he should be sorry and distressed for, before he left the world ? Or what would you think of the traveller, who was pursuing a path, and for the present was determined to pursue it, which he knew was leading him directly out of his way, and every foot of which he *hoped* he should at some future time be obliged to retrace with penitence and tears ? Would you not think such a traveller beside himself ? And yet, what is your hope more consistent than his ?

But on what, my dear child, does your hope, your expectation of future repentance rest ? What *reason* have you to expect that you shall ever be more ready, or more willing, to repent of your sins, than you are now ? Do you flatter yourself that you shall hereafter be favored with more powerful *means* than you have at present ? But what more powerful means can you have ? God will give you no other Bible than that he has given you. He will send you no more awakening truths, no more exciting motives, no better Gospel, than that he has sent, and you stately hear. And he has himself said that, if you will not be persuaded by this Gospel, you would not be persuaded, though one rose to you from the dead.—Do you imagine, then, that your heart will be *more tender*, and that the same means will have a greater effect upon you at some future day ? This seems to be implied in the hope you express, that ‘ your heart is not yet fatally hardened.’ But if not fatally hardened, do you not know, my son, that, under abused privileges and resisted means, your heart is continually hardening ? Do you not feel that your sensibilities are less easily excited, and that your soul is becoming stupid and callous ? And have you not reason to know, persisting in your present course, that the same means which now affect you, and make you solemn, will shortly have this power over you no more ?—You cannot expect, that while you delay, and do nothing but sin, the hold of sin upon your affections, the power of it in your heart, will be gradually weakened ; for the opposite of this must be the inevitable result. Your habits of sin are constantly confirming ; the avenues to temptation are opening wider and wider ; Satan is confining you more closely in his snare ; and the foundation of

the separating wall between you and your God is becoming broader and deeper, and more firmly laid. As the number of your sins, too, increases, this wall of separation is growing higher as well as broader; your debt to justice is swelling to a more enormous amount; and the work of repentance is becoming every day and hour more painful and difficult.—Your last hope, then, must be, that God hereafter will be more *propitious* than he is now, and will grant you the more effectual strivings of his Spirit. It is my earnest prayer that this may be the case; but still, on what grounds is such an interposition of mercy to be reasonably expected? When you are continually offending God by your sins; when you are wearying out his patience by long and criminal delays; if he will not be favorable now, how can you expect he will be more propitious at a later day?

But in conclusion, my dear child, (for full as my heart is, I must conclude,) *who has promised you a later day?* Where is your assurance of any future time? If you say, ‘I will delay religion till another year;’ before the seasons of the present year have half revolved, disease and death may invade, and you are gone. Or if you say, ‘I will delay religion till another Sabbath;’ recollect that the sun of another Sabbath you may never see. It will rise and shine with its accustomed splendor, but it may shine upon the clods that cover your mouldering remains.—We little think, amid the noise and bustle of the world, of the shortness and uncertainty of this our last trial. The young, especially, are prone to flatter themselves with the promise of long life, and to forget the near but dreaded footsteps of death. I readily admit, that you have as much assurance of living many years, as any of your companions; but this, you are aware, is no assurance at all. The shuttle may have already passed the loom, and woven your winding-sheet. The stuff may now be prepared and seasoned, which is to construct your coffin. The feet of those who have entombed others may be almost at the door, to carry your breathless body out. Is this, then, a place to trifle and delay? Is it safe, under such circumstances, to put off *at all* the work of preparation for a dying hour? No, my dear child, whom I love as myself, and whose salvation is dear to me as my own, you know it cannot be safe. And why then will you do it? Why have you done it? And why do you still think of continuing your delay?—But I can proceed no further, though I know not how or where to stop. Remember that, if you slight this warning, you can never have a more solemn one from me;—and should I not live to meet you again, or to afford you another, you will receive this as *my last*. I have long hoped, through the mercy of God in Christ, to stand hereafter on the right hand of my Judge. I charge you, my son, to meet me there. Let no worldly pursuit or concern be suffered to take off your thoughts

from this. Seek, *first of all*, the kingdom of God and his righteousness. Seek these things now. Yes, now, in this accepted time and day of salvation—now, whilst the enemy of your soul is fearing lest you should escape his snare—now, whilst your best earthly friend is pleading with you and for you with earnestness and hope—now, whilst the heavens are waiting to rejoice over your repentance and conversion—at *this present moment*, so critical, so eventful, awake at once from the slumber of sin, break the chain that has so long bound you, and in the strength of Christ—the proffered strength of the omnipotent Spirit—give away your heart and soul to God.

I remain your affectionate father,

Boston, January, 1830.

REVIEWS.

AN ARTICLE ON ASSOCIATIONS IN THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, SEPTEMBER 1829.

DURING the month succeeding the publication of this number of the Examiner, we were repeatedly asked if we had read Dr. Channing's famous article on Associations? We mention this circumstance to show; in the first place, that the article is, in this region, a famous one; and, secondly, that we divulge no secret in attributing its authorship to Dr. Channing.

The author seems to have been struck with the existence of the numerous societies around him. "Every thing is now done by societies."—"You can scarcely name an object for which some institution has not been formed."—Here is a new power brought to bear on society, and it is a great moral question how it ought to be viewed, and what duties it imposes.

After stating a few of the common arguments in favor of Associations, the author raises a warning voice against their influence. He dwells upon the necessity of keeping the mind independent of foreign powers; makes all virtue to consist in individual action, in inward energy, in self-determination; represents this inward power, which is to triumph over and control the influence of society, as the great object of our moral being; and begs repeatedly and most earnestly that he may not be misunderstood.

In our opinion, the writer of this article commenced with a vague, indefinite prejudice against Associations. It would seem as if he had promised to furnish something for the Examiner, and laying hold of this floating idea about the vast number of societies, and working it up into a portentous "sign of the times," resolved to write an article upon it. Accordingly he lays down a few prin-

ciples on which to build a theory respecting the effect of associated effort on the mind. But when he comes to raise his superstructure, he finds that the ground he has taken is by far too broad ; his superstructure will not cover his foundation ; still he proceeds, evidently under great embarrassment and with many misgivings, to stretch out his tottering frame-work from corner to corner. He qualifies, commends, apologizes, and begs not to be misunderstood so frequently, that the impression left upon the reader, is, that the author mistrusted the soundness of his own work. We say with perfect sincerity, that we found as many arguments in this article in favor of Associations as against them ; for the author being, as in our opinion he generally is, under the influence of the associating principle rather than of stern judgement, was caught by some chance thoughts that came along in connection with his main subject ; and being more fond of discursiveness than careful about consistency, has inadvertently brought forward some of the best arguments that are offered in favor of Associations.

We shall not enter at large into the general subject of Associations. If the reader will turn to Dr. Channing's article, he will find as much in their praise as we should dare to advance. He will also be amused with the fact, that much of this praise is given in the way of retraction and apology, and that too, because the author was evidently frightened at the application of his own principles. We agree with him entirely as to the value of an independent judgement, and of freedom from the tyranny of customs and opinions ; and we know, too, that we are in danger of losing these by an ill regulated intercourse with the world. But then we were surprised that the writer, with all the reverence for human nature expressed in his Sermon at Providence, should be so much afraid of trusting such "godlike" creatures as men, together. How can their mutual influence be otherwise than salutary ? Is the mansion which Christ is preparing for each of his disciples a hermit's cell ? Then why does this eulogist of 'godlike human nature' fear the mutual influence of his fellow beings in this world, if so little change is necessary to fit them for associating in heaven ?

The truth is, the writer has not been to the Bible for his knowledge of human nature. He is therefore at the mercy of every floating theory that comes into his mind. His opinion of man, as may be seen by comparing this article with the Sermon referred to, varies with the nature of the subject on which he proposes to write. On every principle of common sense, merely, the author has in this article mistaken our character as social beings. He seems to regard man as possessing a sort of waxen nature, which he has the power of hardening or softening at any moment, as occasion may require. If an unholy influence approaches, he can harden into an unyielding resistance ; if a good influence comes

over him, he can, simply by the diffusion of a mysterious warmth, receive its impress, and retain it, ever after, amidst all the adverse influences of the world. The experience of a single day spent in the world is enough to melt this frost-work theory. We should say it was the offspring of a mind, whose knowledge of the world was speculative rather than practical; of one who looked down upon his fellow-creatures with an air of superiority, and would retire into the chambers of his own soul, and shut the doors about him, were it not that some must be admitted to burn incense. The praise which he has elsewhere lavished upon human nature, seems, after reading this article, to have been bestowed chiefly, because human nature was *his* nature. If we were to act upon the principles here recommended, every heart would be an island surrounded by a cold flood, and cut off from the free interchange of the kindest and best sympathies of man. For since "all virtue consists in *individual* action, *inward* energy, and *self* determination," we must all become monks and nuns; and "that unostentatious and unpraised society, which God has instituted, a family," and "that shelter, home, which nature rears," must be abandoned. But rather than believe that the writer intended so much as this, we will presume that he has inadvertently crossed his own path, and that he forgot the first part of his article, when he wrote so feelingly in the latter part in praise of *domestic* Associations. We may account for these contradictions, and for others which abound in his writings, from the fact that he seems never to calculate the tendency of his own principles; so that when he runs against a well-established truth, he must stop, apologize, explain, retract, and "beg not to be misunderstood."

From general principles, the author proceeds to treat of Associations in particular. He begins with a subject which he had no right to speak upon; we mean Revivals of Religion. What can Dr. Channing know about revivals? It is the height of presumption for a man, shut out from the world so long as he has been, to pretend to describe the progress and effects of a revival. But since "the English Traveller," has been through the country, and printed his book, any one can avail himself of his accurate observation, just as if he had been himself an eye-witness. That book is like the lying spirit in the mouth of all the Prophets of Ahab. By means of it, Unitarian ministers, who have never seen a revival, can string together slang phrases about "inquiry meetings," and "sudden conversions," and gratify a morbid appetite in the irreligious community for wholesale and coarse reprobation of those things at which they wonder and perish. Let us see if Dr. Channing's speculative acquaintance with revivals is as accurate as his knowledge of human nature.

"In these feverish seasons, religion, or what bears the name, is spread as by contagion, and to escape it is almost as difficult as to avoid a raging epidemic. Whoever knows anything of human nature, knows the effect of excitement in a crowd. When systematically prolonged and urged onward, it subverts deliberation and self-control. The individual is lost in the mass, and borne away as in a whirlwind. The prevalent emotion, be it love or hatred, terror or enthusiasm, masters every mind, which is not fortified by a rare energy, or secured by a rare insensibility. In revivals, a multitude are subjected at once to strong emotions, which are swelled and perpetuated by the most skilful management. The individual is never suffered to escape the grasp of the leading or subordinate agents in the work. A machinery of social influences, of 'inquiry meetings,' of 'anxious meetings,' of conferences, of prayer meetings, of perpetual private or public impulses, is brought to bear on the diseased subject, until, exhausted in body and mind, he becomes the passive, powerless recipient of whatever form of impressions it may be thought fit to give him. Happily for mankind, our nature loses its sensibility to perpetual stimulants, and of consequence a revival is succeeded by what is called 'a dull, dead, stupid season.' This dull time is a merciful repose granted by Providence to the overwrought and oppressed mind, and gives some chance for calm, deliberate, individual thought and action. Thus the kindness of nature is perpetually counterworking the excesses of men, and a religion, which begins in partial insanity, is often seen to attain by degrees to the calmness and dignity of reason."

Now we cannot find it in our hearts to return railing for railing upon such an awful subject. We believe that revivals are the work of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when we hear one of our fellow beings railing at them, our heart dies within us. There is a sin unto death: we may not say particularly, in what it consists, or who has committed it—but we know that it has reference to the Holy Spirit, and he who commits it, Christ has said, "hath never forgiveness." On that soul, the secret curse of the Almighty has fallen; it has sinned against the last effort which God makes for the salvation of man; no strivings of the Spirit shall call it to repentance: it remains this side of eternity only to treasure up wrath. Therefore we always tremble, when we hear a man speaking against revivals, lest it lead him insensibly to the commission of a sin, for the forgiveness of which the great Intercessor will refuse to plead!

The writer comes next to Missionary Societies. As a specimen of his feelings and language towards Orthodox missions, we quote the following.

"So possessed are the minds of multitudes with the supreme importance of this object, that there seems to them a piety in withholding what would otherwise have been thought due to a poor relative, that it may be sent across oceans to pagan lands. We have heard that delicate kindnesses, which once flowed from the more prosperous to the less prosperous members of a large family, and which bound society together by that love which is worth all bonds, are diminished since the late excitement in favor of the heathen. And this we do not wonder at. In truth, we rather wonder that any thing is done for the temporal comfort of friends where the doctrine on which modern missions chiefly rests, is believed. We refer to the doctrine, that the whole heathen world are on the brink of a bottomless and endless hell; that thousands every day, and millions every year, are sinking into this abyss of torture and woe; and that nothing can save them but sending them our religion. We see not how they who so believe, can give their families or friends a single comfort, much less an ornament of life. They must be strongly tempted, one would think, to stint

themselves and their dependents to necessities, and to cast their whole remaining substance into the treasury of Missionary Societies."

We would respectfully inquire if the "Unitarian mission to India" failed, because Unitarians bestowed all their superfluous wealth on their poor relations? Are they Unitarians who are accustomed to deny themselves large parties, balls, and the theatre, for the purposes of charity? Where did Dr. Channing learn the petty scandal on which the first part of these remarks was probably founded? If he will condescend to come down and associate with *men*, instead of relying on a few favored admirers, for his knowledge of the world, he will learn that the private charities of the Orthodox have *increased*, "since the late excitement in favor of the heathen." The reader will have observed the spleen exhibited in the above paragraph; and he will find several of the same character in this article. A great mind will be great, even in its sarcasm.

Here, too, we have a minister in the metropolis of New-England, the Leader of a rich sect, the Great Apostle of Liberal Christianity, reclining at his ease in his study, jeering at the self-denying efforts of those who, in obedience to the commands of Christ, are sending the Gospel to the heathen! Here is the most distinguished writer in the Unitarian magazine, whose motto is, 'Speaking the truth in love,' winding up a clause in a sarcastic sentence with a rhetorical flourish about "a bottomless and endless hell!" We *do* believe, as he says, that endless punishment awaits the wicked. What then? Are we not sincere in our belief? Yes, but "one would think that they would stint themselves to the necessities of life." Restore to us the funds taken from our sister churches, and then it will be time enough to use such language. Go through the State, and see a little church in one place, worshipping in the town-hall, and another in a court-house, and ask, who compelled them to flee from their temples, and abandon their property; and you may see another reason why one could think we should "stint ourselves to the necessities of life."

If Unitarians will act upon the principles laid down in this article, we shall hear no more of the "Unitarian mission to India." The correspondence of Dr. Ware and Rammohun Roy will be consigned to an alcove in the College Library, and the Rev. Mr. Adam having been already obliged to resort "to a secular employment" for a livelihood, Rammohun will be left alone to plant India with his Hindoo-Unitarianism. We secretly suspect that one great object of this article, or this part of it, was to cover the Unitarian retreat from the missionary field. The leaders have found it utterly impossible to rouse them in the cause, and therefore Dr. Channing must appear with an article to prove that associated effort has an

injurious influence upon the mind, and that "all virtue consists in individual action!"

The author proceeds to notice Associations for suppressing Intemperance, and thinks that their object is of undoubted utility, though some of them may have erred in requiring abstinence from wine.

"When we consider, that wine is universally acknowledged to be an innocent and often a salutary beverage, that Jesus sanctioned its use by miraculously increasing it at the marriage feast, that the Scriptures teach us to thank God for it as a good gift, intended to 'gladden the heart of man,' and when to these considerations we add, that wine countries are distinguished for temperance, we are obliged to regard this pledge as injudicious."

The fact that wine is innocent may perhaps be "universally acknowledged," in the circle in which the writer moves, but we can assure him that in other circles this is not the case. We are surprised, too, that he did not know that there is more alcohol in our wines than in those of Palestine and other "wine countries," and that his argument, therefore, was without force. Why will a man who knows so little of men and things venture an attempt at being practical?

On the subject of Bible Societies, we quote the following appeal.

"We have a still more important remark to make in regard to Bible Societies. In our last number, we noticed an edition of the New Testament recently published in Boston, and differing from those in common use, by a new translation of those passages of the Greek original, of which the true reading was lost or neglected when the received English version was made. This edition of the New Testament we stated to be *undoubtedly* more correct, more conformed to the original, than our common editions. On this point we speak strongly, because we wish to call to it the attention of Bible Societies, and of all conscientious Christians. To such we say,—Here is a translation, undoubtedly more faithful to the original than that in common use. You have here in greater purity what Jesus Christ said, and what his apostles wrote; and if so, you are bound by your allegiance to Christ to substitute this for the common translation. We know that uneducated Christians cannot settle this question. We therefore respectfully, and with solemnity, solicit for it the attention of learned men, of Christian ministers, of professors of theology of every sect and name."

This earnest and solemn appeal relates to a Translation of the N. T. as amended by Griesbach. We are sorry to say that the labor of the Translator, and the pathos of Dr. Channing are rendered useless by the fact, that Dr. Knapp's Testament is now admitted by German scholars, Liberal as well as Orthodox, to be superior to Griesbach's. It has gone through several large editions, (the last in 1829,) and is the most highly esteemed and most generally used in Germany. In all probability, "we have *here* in" still "greater purity what Christ taught and his Apostles wrote" than in Griesbach, and must therefore decline the new Translation.

The writer next considers the Sabbath Associations. He begins by asserting, that our Sabbath is not the same institution with the ancient Sabbath.

"We know, that it is said, that the ancient Sabbath remains untouched; that Christianity has only removed it from the last to the first day of the week, and that this is a slight, unessential change, leaving the old institution whole and unbroken. To this we have several replies. In the first place, this change of days, which Christianity is supposed to make, is not unessential, but vital, and subversive of the ancient institution. The end of the ancient Sabbath was the commemoration of God's resting from his works, and for this end, the very day of the week on which he rested, was most wisely selected. Now we maintain, that to select the first day of the week, the very day on which he began his works, and to select and separate this in commemoration of another event, of Christ's resurrection, is wholly to set aside the ancient Sabbath. We cannot conceive of a more essential departure from the original ordinance. This substitution, as it is called, is a literal, as well as a virtual abolition. Such is our first remark."

And in our opinion a very weak one. The whole of this reasoning proceeds on the supposition that the *sole* object of the ancient Sabbath was to celebrate the cessation of the Most High from his work! But this is by no means an enlightened and liberal view of the institution. It had its origin in the nature of man; in his need of a season of entire rest from labor, as well as of a particular time appropriated to the duties of religion. The reason assigned for the selection of the seventh day in preference to any other, viz: that "in it God rested from his work," is the reason why the Sabbath was appointed for *that* day, and not for the institution of a day of rest. This, as we have before said, arises from the necessities of man. The mere change of the day, therefore, does not affect the institution; man has the same wants under the Christian dispensation as under the old; he still needs one day in seven for rest and abstraction from the cares of the world; and what day could be more appropriately set apart for this object than that on which the Saviour rose from the dead? Still, this circumstance of Christ's resurrection is not to be regarded as the foundation of the Christian Sabbath, but only as the reason for its occurrence on that day, in preference to any other.

"We say secondly, that not a word is uttered in the New Testament of the first day being substituted for the seventh. Surely so striking a change would not have been made in a universal and perpetual law of God, without some warning. We ask for some hint of this modification of the fourth commandment. We find not a syllable."

Does the writer mean to say that he must have a *positive* command at every turn? Why then does he admit females to his communion? There is no special command on this point in the word of God. And where has God commanded us not to celebrate the passover; or to give up the rite of circumcision? "We find not a syllable."

But the most remarkable argument is yet to come.

"We say thirdly, that the first Christians knew nothing of this substitution. Our evidence here is complete. The first converts to Christianity were Jews, and these converts had at first no conception of the design of Christianity to supersede the law of Moses. This law they continued to observe for years, and to observe it as rigorously as ever. When Paul visited Jerusalem, after many labors among the Gentiles, the Elders 'said to him, Thou seest, brother, how

many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law.* Of course they all observed the Jewish Sabbath, or seventh day of rest, the greatest of Jewish festivals, whilst, as we all believe, they honored also the first day, the remembrancer of Christ's resurrection. This state of things existed for years in the primitive church. The two days were observed together. Nothing more seems necessary to disprove unanswerably the common doctrine, that the apostles enjoined the substitution of the first for the seventh day."

The reasons why they did not enjoin this substitution are very obvious. First, they would have exposed themselves and their converts to the civil penalties, had they urged the immediate cessation of the Jewish Sabbath. The observance of the first day was brought in by degrees, and to this end, as a great writer expresses himself, "God took all occasions to honor it." He sent down his spirit on that day† at Pentecost; and directed Christians to meet on that day to break bread, and to contribute for the relief of the poor. Thus the change was wisely introduced by degrees. Secondly, God had regard to the nature of man as a creature of prejudice. It would have been doing great violence to the feelings of the early Jewish converts to compel them to renounce immediately all their old customs and institutions. Therefore they were kindly permitted to observe for some time their ancient passover, and circumcision, and the seventh day, till clearer light and gradual indications of the will of heaven, had introduced the new dispensation in its fulness.

We are astonished that the writer did not perceive this striking and beautiful feature in God's treatment of the Jewish nation. Did it never occur to him that Paul, in accommodation to the prejudices of the Jews, "took Timothy and circumcised him"? We can assure Dr. C. that Paul, with all his orthodoxy, was a very liberal man, and that it was his liberal views of Christianity that dictated the following passage, which Dr. C. has made the basis of his 4th argument.

"Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days.‡ This passage is very plain. It is evaded, however, by the plea, that the word "Sabbath," was used to express not only the seventh day, but other festivals or days of rest. But when we recollect that the word is used by Paul in this place without any exception or limitation, and that it was employed at that time, most frequently and almost wholly, to express the seventh day, or weekly Sabbath, we shall see, that we have the strongest reason for supposing this institution to be intended by the apostle."

But then the writer says,

"That a Christian, after reading this passage, should 'judge,' or condemn his brethren, for questioning or rejecting his particular notions of the Sabbath, is a striking proof of the slow progress of tolerant and liberal principles among men. We need not add, after these remarks, how unjustifiable we deem it to enforce particular modes of observing this day, by an array of Associations."

* Acts, xxi. 20.

† Lev. xxiii. 15, 16.

‡ Col. ii. 16.

Now the writer either does not understand the declaration of Paul, or he has misrepresented the object of the Sabbath Associations. For it is not our purpose to compel men to observe the first day, rather than the seventh. Paul and we are very liberal on this point. If men conscientiously prefer the seventh day to the first, we will respect their opinion; and if a majority of the people are of this mind, we will request Dr. Channing to draw up another petition to Congress, to stop the mails on that day, and will promise to sign it. We wish that the original design of Him who gave man his nature, and knows best what is good for him, and has therefore appointed one day in seven as a day of rest, should continue to be regarded. All this canting about "the slow progress of tolerant and liberal principles amongst men," is supremely childish, and is proof only of the slow progress of such principles in the writer's mind.

The manner in which the Sabbath is treated in this article deserves the stern disapprobation of every friend of religion and his country. We have heard that one and another of the licentious have said, "We are glad to find that Dr. Channing does not believe in the Sabbath." All restraint is now taken off, so far as they felt any restraint from the word of God. The most painful part of the article, however, is that in which, by cold commendations, he endeavors to recommend the observance of the institution. "We earnestly *recommend* the Lord's day," is his language. Thus having relieved men of all obligation from the word of God, to "remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy," he is alarmed at what he has done, and substitutes for the command of the Most High, his own recommendation!

The writer insists that the Jews were not accustomed to keep the Sabbath strictly, but spent a part of the day in feasting. The inference which he would draw from this fact, indicates a degree of ignorance of Jewish customs. The Jews were taught to consider the Sabbath as a joyful day. Sorrow on the Sabbath was an indication of great calamity. See Hos. ii. 11. Lam. ii. 6. 1 Macc. i. 41. They not only did not deem it *inconsistent* with its sacredness to dance, sing, and play on instruments of music, but this manner of observing it was in accordance with the spirit of their religion. By consulting the passages referred to below,* it will be seen, however, that their songs, music, and dancing, on these occasions, were altogether of a religious nature. Furthermore, if the writer meant to say, that the Jews did not enjoin a strict observance of the day, we refer him to a single passage. After Christ had cured the blind man, they said, "This man cannot be of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath." That a

* Ex. xv. 20, 21. 32. vi. 7. 2 Sam. vi. 14. Ps. lxxviii. 25—27. cxlix. 3. cl. 4. See Jahn's Archeology, Sect. 139.

man should make such representations of the custom of the Jews in regard to the Sabbath, and leave the reader to infer that *he* was at liberty to feast luxuriously on that day, without pointing out the difference between Jewish and modern festivals, or making one suggestion respecting the difference in the state of society amongst us and the Jews, is altogether unpardonable. And for a teacher of Christianity, in a community such as ours, to throw out so unguarded a sentence as the following; "In the time of Christ, we find him bidden to a feast on the Sabbath day and accepting the invitation," is, we think, highly criminal. We can already fancy that we see a fashionable infidel coming home from a dinner party on Sabbath afternoon, and his excuse is, 'Why, Dr. Channing says that Christ was invited to a dinner party on the Sabbath, and accepted the invitation!' Thus irreligion will soon be recommended on the authority of Dr. Channing, and from the example of Christ himself.

We should have said nothing respecting the literary character of this writer, were it not for the determination which Unitarians in this country and in England seem to have formed, to exalt him above the stars; in doing which they have set reason, justice, truth and soberness at defiance. Encomiums have been lavished on him, which would have become the populace who deified Herod, rather than men professing to be in their senses. In one of the speeches at a late dinner of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, we find the following language:

"In connection with our progress in America, I cannot avoid referring to that splendid writer and high-souled man, whose services to literature have been of the highest order, and whose career was marked by a series of pure and beautiful triumphs; whether he unveiled the gentle, the generous, the judicious Fenelon to the stronger admiration and more correct estimate of mankind, or elevated yet higher our Milton, our own English poet,—him whose mind the mind of Channing most resembles"—!! *

We speak the feeling of our hearts when we say, that we have sincerely sympathized with Dr. C. for being made the subject of such extravagant praise and fulsome adulation. But then it has occurred to us, (and we ask the reader to consult his observation, and see if it be not so,) that the character of the praise which a man receives is generally in accordance with the character of his mind. There is something in real genius that awes the beholder: it forbids the out-breaking of flashy, conceited adulation, or the heaping together of extravagant epithets, which seem more like burlesque than sober truth. Now the character of the encomiums which have been lavished upon this writer would lead to the suspicion that there is something wanting to inspire the respect usually paid to great men. We record it for the verification of future time, that *that there is no man, whose literary celebrity is*

* The individual who exhibited this affecting instance of folly, was Dr. John Bowring.

-now so great, who will be so soon forgotten. He is not a deep, original thinker; he wants the moral courage which always accompanies an original mind. Much of his talent lies in the easy flow of his sentences; and his writings, which are very discursive, are popular, at the present time, because the present is a discursive age. We do not hesitate to say, that he has contributed but a very small share to the stock of human thoughts; and that he will not have extended the boundaries of knowledge, or be regarded hereafter in any other respect than as one who spread out his sentiments in pure language, and with pleasing illustrations. Still, there is the same indistinctness and want of point in his illustrations as in his reasoning. Most of his thoughts are very common, and are recommended by nothing but the chaste language in which they are clothed; and when he falls upon a sentiment of remarkable quality, he is sure to dilute it to a very low proof. As a specimen of his style, mode of thinking, &c., we give the following from the article before us.

"We can easily illustrate, by examples, the inferiority of human associations. In Boston there are two Asylums for children, which deserve, we think, a high place among useful institutions. Not a little time is spent upon them. Hundreds conspire to carry them on, and we have anniversaries to collect crowds for their support. And what is the amount of good accomplished? Between one and two hundred children are provided for, a number worthy of all the care bestowed on these charities. But compare this number with all the children of this city, with the thousands who throng our streets and our schools. And how are these fed, clothed, educated? We hear of no subscriptions, no anniversaries for their benefit; yet how they flourish, compared with the subjects of Asylums! These are provided for by that unostentatious and unpraised society, which God has instituted, a family. That shelter, home, which nature rears, protects them, and it is an establishment worth infinitely more than all the institutions, great or small, which man has devised"—"Let us take another example, the Hospital in the same metropolis; a noble institution, worthy of high praise. But where is it that the sick of our city are healed? Must you look for them in the Hospital? You may find there perhaps, and should rejoice to find there, fifty or sixty beds for the poor. The thousands who sicken and die among us, are to be found in their homes, watched over by the nursing care of mothers and sisters, surrounded by that tenderness which grows up only at home."

As Coleridge would say, these are "empty truisms, blown up into illustrious bubbles." The reasoning here, we think, is a little weaker than that respecting the Sabbath. It is a precious specimen of the *non sequitur*. Those who *have* parents and homes, are in no need of asylums; therefore, those who *have not* parents and homes —. Those who are blessed with mothers and sisters to watch over them in sickness, need no hospital; therefore, those who *have no* mothers and sisters —. We do him no injustice when we say that he has a great many thoughts of the same size and value. He picks up curious little shells on "the shore of the great ocean of truth," which the pearl divers had trodden under foot. He never throws out generous ingots of thought, but penuriously spreads a penny-weight over a large

surface. We know of no writer of moderate reputation, who has so poor a stock of *words* at his command. In all his writings, you never meet with a particular word that makes you pause at the comprehensiveness of its meaning, or that shows you, by its peculiar adaptation to the place where it is set, that the writer had been down in the mines, and had chosen it out from a thousand. There is throughout the same copious and tiresome flow of common-place words; so that the reader often casts his eye down the page, and anticipates the sentiment, instead of waiting for the feeble and tardy succession of words to pass through his mind. We began to read the first article in the last Number of the *Examiner*, on National Literature; but six pages of repetitious and dreamy trains of thought made us weary of the piece, and we laid it aside, not however, until the writer's repeated request "not to be misunderstood," and the frequent recurrence of "gifted men," and "gifted minds," left no doubt that the author was Dr. Channing. We should infer that there had been more of a feminine than of a manly influence exerted upon the mind of this writer. It seems as if he had associated more with females than with men, and that he wrote to suit their modes of thought. Yet we fear that we may be doing injustice to some of our female friends, who have been preserved from the enervating influence of the flimsy, ephemeral literature of the day.

We cannot contemplate the career of Dr. Channing but with extreme pain. He was once a very serious minded man, a professed believer in what we deem the religion of the Bible. But of this faith he has made shipwreck, and has been among the first to let in that flood of infidelity which, under a fashionable name, has swept over the altars of New England. We are taught by the article which we have now considered, that his designs are not yet fully accomplished, but that, having done all in his power to overthrow the faith of the Pilgrims, he is working at the foundation of an institution which they enjoined upon their children to defend. When licentiousness has reached its height in our land, and a jubilee is proclaimed to those in the upper classes of society who have hitherto been withheld by public opinion from an open renunciation of the Sabbath, Dr. Channing will be referred to as the "gifted mind," who, with commendable caution, first unloosed the yoke of a superstitious observance. But there is already a blot upon his name which will cleave to it till time shall be no more. The "central gallows"! We look far down into the period of coming glory to the church, and see a preacher, on some great occasion, recounting to the people the enmity and opposition of men to Christ. He tells them, 'There was once a man, who boasted that with one hand he would overthrow his religion;

another who manifested his hatred to that religion by libels on its sacred character; and another, who once was heard to preach Jesus and him *crucified*, was left, at last, to reproach his cross as "a central gallows," and an ignominious scaffold. Oh, if it be true,' he will say, 'that that cross bore an atoning sacrifice, and God manifest in the flesh was there reconciling the world unto himself, and it was then, and is now, and shall be to all eternity, the theme of wonder and praise to angels and principalities and powers, what a remembrance will wait through everlasting ages on his name who pointed at it as a scaffold, and poured upon it his scorn.'—May it appear in the judgement that he fled at last to that cross as his only hope, and that he did not go into eternity till the blood shed for the remission of sins was applied to his soul, and his peace was made with God through the atonement of his Son!

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW FOR JAN. 1830. ARTICLE III.

OPPRESSION has drenched the annals of our race in tears and blood. Communities have in general respected the rights of each other, no further than they have been compelled by fear or interest. The might of the strongest has been the title of sovereignty, and the limit of power the boundary of dominion.

While we make these remarks, we would not forget that, during the last fifty years, the spirit of the Gospel has been exerting a redeeming influence upon the public sentiment of Christendom. Hence it is that so much has been accomplished for the abolition of the slave trade, and even of slavery itself. Hence the "poetry of war" has lost much of its enchantment, and the civic wreath has begun to rival the laurels of the hero. Hence the desolating march of imperial ambition, like that of Napoleon; foreign interferences, like those of France and Austria, in suppressing the revolutions in Spain and Naples; and wanton partitions of defenceless territory, like those which have dismembered the land of the ill-fated Kosciusko; have been regarded by so many thousands in Christendom with indignation and abhorrence. Hence, we add, the practical operation of the policy of Great Britain in regard to the people of Hindostan, has been so often and so severely condemned; and hence also it is, that we ourselves, the Christians of the United States, have been so often the theme of reproach and invective, in consequence of our treatment of the Aborigines of our country.

Of the causes of the rapid disappearance of these sons of the forest, we cannot now speak with particularity. Thousands have perished by the sword of the whites, and thousands more by their

own tomahawks, in their desperate wars with each other. But while the sword and the tomahawk have slain their thousands, the 'red dragon' of intemperance has slain his ten thousands.

For the general course of measures relative to the Indians, previous to the revolution, the kings and cabinets of Great Britain are chiefly responsible. Since that period, our governments have professed to consult the best good of the tribes within our borders, and no inconsiderable effort has been made by some of our chief magistrates, to induce them to adopt the arts and usages of civilization. But our extensive purchases of their lands have had a most disastrous influence upon their character and condition. "When the white man puts down his foot, he never takes it up again. It grows fast and spreads wide." After relinquishing the best portions of their hunting-grounds, many tribes have been compelled to retire into some new wilderness, or to change at once all their modes of life, and attempt to derive subsistence from the cultivation of a pittance of their original territory. Those who have emigrated, have usually been despised by the tribes in their neighborhood, and have been obliged to submit to intolerable privation and insult. Of those who have endeavored to till the ground, the most have utterly failed of success, from want of a suitable preparatory discipline.

By the sale of their lands, they have also been brought into more immediate contact with the unprincipled portion of the whites. Their morals have thus been most dreadfully corrupted. The presents and annuities, which, have been distributed so freely among them, by the U. S. Agents, have allured into their midst a swarm of traders, more rapacious than the locusts of Egypt. We allude now more especially to the Northern and North Western tribes. In addition to the traders with their sponging extortion, there have been the white hunters who, by the payment of a small premium, have been enabled to bear away immense stores of peltry. When the Indian, therefore, has looked around him, and surveyed the cheerless wretchedness of his condition, is it strange that he should so often resort to the inebriating poison, to relieve the anguish of a wounded and mangled heart? The demoralizing and debasing effects of the use of ardent spirits among some of the Indian tribes, it is impossible to exaggerate. A single anecdote, for which we are indebted to the N. A. Review, speaks volumes on this point. "Father," said an aged Potawatomie Chief, after having been urged to remain sober, and make a good bargain for his people, "Father, we care not for the money, nor the land, nor the goods. We want the whiskey. Give us the whiskey. Give us the whiskey."

We entertain no doubt, that a vast amount of the degeneracy and destruction of the sons of the forest has been occasioned by

the surrender of their most valuable domains to their white neighbors. Of this melancholy fact, our present Chief Magistrate seems to be fully aware. "It has long been the policy of government," says his late Message to Congress, "to introduce among them the arts of civilization, in the hope of gradually reclaiming them from a wandering life. This policy, however, has been coupled with another wholly incompatible with its success. Professing a desire to civilize and settle them, we have at the same time lost no opportunity to purchase their lands and thrust them further into the wilderness. Thus, though lavish in its expenditures upon the subject, Government has constantly defeated its own policy." Little should we have anticipated such sentiments, as a preamble to the annunciation of a plan to remove all the Indians of the South, to the boundless and barren prairies beyond the Mississippi! To compel the Indians to emigrate from their accustomed abodes, or to obtain subsistence by agricultural industry, without previous education, is a measure which has no countenance from the dictates of philanthropy, or the precepts of religion. They must be gradually propitiated by the influence of salutary example; not driven by the stern mandates of inexorable necessity. This fact is exemplified in the great success which has attended the labors of "education families;"—that is, families, in which are to be found mechanics and agriculturists, as well as literary and religious teachers.

So eminently successful have been the experiments of these "families," established among the Indians residing in the Southern States, that not a few of our wisest citizens have been greatly animated by the prospect. They have cherished a strong hope, that the period was at hand, when a part at least of the debt which Americans owe to this much abused people, would be honorably cancelled. But a portentous storm has of late been gathering; and unless God avert the omen, the bolts of desolation seem to be inevitable. A CRISIS now exists, which demands the most serious attention of every patriot and Christian in America.

Within the chartered limits of North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi, are four tribes of Indians—the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws and Creeks—consisting of at least 60,000 souls. Of these tribes, the Cherokees have made by far the greatest advances in civilization and Christianity. According to a letter of one of their chiefs, it appears, that they began to introduce among them some of the simpler arts of manufacture, previous to the close of the last century. A Moravian school was established among them in 1801. This has been instrumental of much good to the natives. Various causes have since operated to encourage the philanthropic and pious of different Christian denominations, to establish 'education families' in different parts of

the Cherokee country. A decided change has been produced in the condition and character of the inhabitants. "Most families," if we may credit the statement of Charles R. Hicks—a very intelligent and virtuous chief—"most families cultivate from ten, twenty, thirty, to forty acres of land, *without the assistance of black people.*" This statement, which was made more than twelve years since, is confirmed by some statistics published in the *Missionary Herald*, relative to the progress of the Cherokees in civilization. By an enumeration in 1826, it was found, that they possessed 2,943 ploughs, 172 waggons, 2,500 sheep, 7,600 horses, 22,000 cattle, and 46,000 swine. When we remember, that the population cannot be estimated higher than 15,000 souls, we must be satisfied that a people, thus furnished, are not necessitated to scour the forests, in order to procure "game for subsistence," or "peltry for sale."

To show how generally the useful arts have been introduced among them, we would mention, that at the time of the above enumeration, they had 8 cotton machines, 762 looms, 2,488 spinning wheels, 10 saw-mills, 31 grist-mills, and 62 blacksmiths' shops. Should an enumeration be made at the present time, the result would show a very considerable increase in all these particulars.

Suffice it to say, that so great has been the change in the feelings and habits of the Cherokees, during the last thirty years, and more especially during the last twelve years, that they have been prepared for an entire revolution in their mode of government. Agreeably to the suggestion and advice of President Jefferson, they have, at length, with great unanimity, adopted a form of government, which, in its essential features, corresponds with our own. A printing press has been established, and a newspaper, edited by an intelligent native, who was educated in Connecticut, has now nearly reached the close of its second volume. The matter of this paper is published partly in English, and partly in Cherokee. Although it is not seven years, since the language was reduced to writing, by the wonderful invention of their syllabic alphabet, and not two years since it was printed, yet so rapid has been the progress of general education, that it is now read by a majority of the people. Very many not only read, but *write* the English language. For years past, native Cherokees, without any assistance, have transacted public business by written documents; and in a style of correctness and propriety, which might well shame some officers of the United States who have addressed communications to them. The President or principal Chief discharges the duties of his office, in a manner which would not disgrace a governor of one of our own states.

In addition to all this, we should do violence to our own feelings were we to fail of noticing, that several churches have been

gathered among this interesting people. Hundreds regularly assemble on the Sabbath, to listen to the ministers of God. And among those who participate in the celebration of the sacraments, are some of the most intelligent and influential citizens.

So notorious are these and similar facts, that we were utterly confounded, when we saw it stated by a writer in the last number of the North American Review, that he "doubts, whether there is on the face of the globe a more wretched race than the Cherokees." "The great body of the people are in a state of helpless and hopeless poverty. With the same improvidence and habitual indolence, which mark the northern Indians, they have less game for subsistence and less peltry for sale!"—But our confusion vanishes, when we consider the premises from which he drew his conclusions.

"Our personal intercourse with them, (the Indians) has been confined almost to the tribes in the Northwestern regions of the United States, to the Iroquois, the Wyandots, etc. Our general facts and deductions will be principally founded upon what we have seen and heard among these tribes. With the Southern Indians, the Creeks, Cherokees, Choctaws, and Chickasaws, we have not had the same opportunities of personal communication and observation. Of the Creeks and Cherokees, however, we have some knowledge; and so far as our personal intercourse with them has extended, they presented to us the same external appearance, and the same general traits of character, which elsewhere mark the race of red men."

"We have made the inquiry respecting the permanent advantage which any of these tribes have derived from attempts to civilize them, with a full knowledge of the favorable reports that have been circulated concerning the Cherokees. Limited as our intercourse with those Indians has been, we must necessarily draw our conclusions respecting them from facts which have been stated to us, and from the general resemblance they bear to the other cognate branches of the great aboriginal stock. *It is due to truth, that this admission should be made.*" pp. 70, 71.

We entirely coincide with the writer in the last remark. After what we have said respecting the Cherokees, we might leave his statements without further notice. But we would just request the readers of his article, to bear in mind, that his "general facts and deductions," throughout sixty pages, concerning the Cherokees and the other Southern tribes, are not "founded upon what he has seen and heard among" those tribes, but "*are principally founded upon what he has seen and heard among the tribes in the Northwestern regions of the United States.*" These last, from causes which might be easily specified, are probably more debased and miserable, than any tribes in our whole territory. We make this remark on the authority of one, who has had as much opportunity of observation, in regard to their character and condition, as has fallen to the lot of this Reviewer.

Of the Creeks and Cherokees, the Reviewer has "*some knowledge.*" To use a homely phrase, he "has none to speak of," or we should certainly have been more fully informed of the fact. So far then as he wrote from observation, his sweep-

ing statements and opinions, relative to the tribes of the South, especially the Cherokees, are entitled to no more respect, than any considerate man would award to those of a traveller, who should have the effrontery to give a general description of the people of Middlesex county, from a partial acquaintance with a few of the inhabitants of that county, and from an intimate knowledge of the *backwoodsmen* in the distant West.

The other source of his information, if we may judge from his own admission, is mere *hearsay*. What "facts have been stated" to him, or by whom stated, he does not choose to specify. We would take the liberty to ask, also, whether the time has come, for "the inquiry respecting the *permanent* advantage which any of the (Southern) tribes have derived from the attempts to civilize them?" It seems to us, that the inquiry would be more pertinent a generation hence. Meanwhile we would recal to the mind of the Reviewer a passage which he may possibly have forgotten, while quaking at the sight of the "finger of reform."

"The missionary establishments for the education of Indian youth, founded and supported by voluntary contributions, and aided by an annual appropriation from the national treasury, *almost offer an atonement for the past*, AND CERTAINLY STRONG ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE FUTURE." *N. A. R.* April 1827.

What new facts the reviewer has obtained, within the short period which has elapsed since he expressed so much approbation of "the attempts to civilize the Indians," we are at a loss to conjecture. We are sure, however, that those who have had the most personal intercourse with the Southern tribes, and who have been the most familiar with "the attempts to civilize" them, have been unanimous in exciting the sanguine expectations of the philanthropist and Christian. Every month has furnished stronger and still stronger "encouragement for the future." If, therefore, any reliance is to be placed upon the testimony of numerous eye-witnesses, whose veracity is unimpeachable; if any reliance is to be placed upon the statements of many of our most respectable religious and literary journals, relative to the condition and character of the Cherokees; the article in the last *N. A. Review*, upon the "Removal of the Indians," so far as it relates to the Cherokees particularly, is nothing less than a series of unblushing and unpardonable misrepresentations. And little did we anticipate that a writer, who had so distinguished himself by his exposures of the falsehoods and calumnies of the *London Quarterly*, would be found assailing the character of an unfortunate race, with the very weapons which have so often been employed by remorseless hirelings for the destruction of our own national honor.

While the Cherokees have been rapidly advancing in the career of civilization, their progress seems to have been watched with a jealous eye by the people of Georgia. We would here premise, that when we speak of the people of Georgia, we mean the

representatives, senators, and governors of Georgia—the men who have been chosen to act in the legislative and executive departments of the State.

The United States, in a compact with Georgia, in 1802, had promised to extinguish the Indian title to lands within her chartered limits, as soon as it could be done “*peaceably and upon reasonable terms.*” The general government was not bound to put Georgia in possession of these lands, *unless the Indians should be willing to sell them at a fair price.* If the Indians should never be willing, then the United States could never be chargeable with delinquency in the fulfilment of that part of the compact which relates to the extinguishment of the Indian title. The purchase of the lands for the benefit of Georgia depended upon a contingency—the *willingness of the Indians to sell.*

After having disposed of some millions of acres, the Cherokees at length resolved to have no further negotiation on the subject of the cession of territory, being determined to dwell among the sepulchres, and to transmit to their posterity the inheritance of their fathers. The people of Georgia, finding all the efforts of the national executive to be fruitless, and all their own clamors and denunciations abortive, in respect to the extinguishment of the Indian title, openly declared by their senate in 1827, “That the State might properly take possession of the Cherokee country by force, and that it was owing to her moderation and forbearance that she did not thus take possession.” Previous to this declaration, a joint committee of the Legislature had made a report, in which they say, that the European nations asserted successfully the right of occupying such parts “of America as each discovered, and thereby they established their supreme command over it.” Again :

“It may be contended with much plausibility, that there is, in these claims, more of *force*, than of *justice* ; but they are claims which have been recognized and admitted by the whole civilized world ; and it is unquestionably true that, under such circumstances, *force* becomes *right.*”

“Before Georgia became a party to the articles of agreement and cession, [the compact of 1802.] she could rightfully have possessed herself of those lands, either by *negociation* with the Indians, or by *force* ; and she had determined, in one of the two ways, to do so : but by this contract she made it the duty of the United States to sustain the expense of obtaining for her the possession, provided it could be done upon reasonable terms, and by *negociation* ; but in case it should be necessary to resort to *force*, this contract with the United States makes no provision : the consequence is, that Georgia is left untrammelled, and at full liberty to prosecute her rights in that point of view, according to her own discretion, and as though no such contract had been made.”

This is logic with a vengeance. After the avowal of such abominable principles, it is not astonishing that, since that time, the Legislature have voted to annul all the ordinances of the Cherokee government ; to extend the laws of Georgia over all the Indians within her chartered limits ; and to take possession of

a large part of the territory claimed by the citizens of the Cherokee nation. June 1, 1830, is the time assigned for the annihilation of the political existence of the Cherokees !

From the decisions of Georgia, the Cherokees have appealed to the Executive of the United States. And how has their appeal been answered ? The President will protect them in the occupation of their lands, but not in the maintenance of an independent government. And in the occupation of what lands will he protect them ? Such "as they have improved by their industry." "For," says his late message, "it seems visionary to suppose, that claims can be allowed on tracts of country on which they have neither dwelt nor made improvements, merely because they have seen them from the mountain, or passed them in the chase."

The decision of the Executive has filled the Cherokees with consternation. Their appeal is now made to the people and Congress of the United States. Shall this appeal be made in vain ? God forbid.

The Cherokees claim the rights of a sovereign people. The country they inhabit, is an inheritance, which was bequeathed to them by their ancestors. Their title to the soil and jurisdiction, is that of immemorial occupancy and independence. Their sovereignty has never been alienated or forfeited. On the broad principles of natural justice, therefore, the Cherokees can appeal to the world, from the usurpation which is now meditated by the State of Georgia.

But the Cherokees have other claims to the distinction of an independent community. They were always considered such, from the settlement of the country to the time of the Revolution ; and since that period, not less than SIXTEEN TREATIES have been made with them, in all which there is not the most distant intimation, that they are not *lords* as well as *possessors* of their soil. These treaties were made and ratified by some of our most distinguished citizens and public officers. The cabinets of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, were all more or less concerned in negotiating with the Cherokees, relative to the sale of lands—the construction of roads—the apprehension of criminals—and to various other subjects of international welfare. They have had their own statutes, their own magistrates, and their own usages. Hence they are in the treaties properly called the "*Cherokee nation*," and "*citizens of the Cherokee nation*." And hence all our intercourse with them has been precisely that of one independent sovereignty with another.

In consideration of the cession of a large part of their territory to the United States, what remained was "SOLEMNLY GUARANTEED TO THEM FOREVER." As an independent people, they were taken under the patronage of the General Government, and

their condition, for nearly half a century, has been that of a *dependent ally*. The United States have sustained towards them the relation of a guardian. And the only restrictions, upon their sovereignty, are those which they themselves have recognized in amicable treaties. They relate to the sale of lands, and the regulation of trade. The Cherokees agree not to hold a treaty with any power except the United States. Of course, the U. S. must be the exclusive purchasers of Indian lands.

All these points have been most ably substantiated by a writer under the appropriate signature of William Penn. His arguments are irrefragable. There is no possibility of evading their conclusiveness.—If the Cherokees have not a perfect title to their soil, and to the jurisdiction of their soil, then we should despair of establishing the title of any people on earth to soil and jurisdiction. If they voluntarily cede their lands,—or if they melt away from the earth,—or if, in consequence of wanton and murderous war, a conquest of their territory becomes necessary,—then their title is legitimately extinguished. But if, while they can live as they have lived, they are deprived of their lands by the intrusion of white settlers, or if their laws and government are nullified and annihilated by the acts of a single State, or of the United States;—such proceedings can be vindicated by those only, who are prepared to subscribe to the doctrines of tyrants, and burn incense to the monsters of despotism.

In a case like the present—where, aside from the considerations of humanity, generosity, and national honor—the demands of *justice* are reiterated in tones of thunder,—it is truly humiliating to be obliged to notice objections. Objections, however, there are,—objections which have been presented to the public, with all the customary insignia of truth and authority.

The writer in the North American Review, obviously aware of the inevitable inference of all honest argumentation on principles of natural justice, has plainly asserted, that

“We have long since passed the period of abstract rights. Political questions are complicated in their relations, involving considerations of *expediency* and *authority*, as well as of natural justice.” N. A. R. p. 112.

If words have any obvious meaning, this language, plausible as it appears, contains a most execrable sentiment! If the rights of men are to be determined by “considerations of expediency and authority,” as well as of natural justice, and this determination is to be made by those who have the physical strength to secure whatever their avarice and ambition may demand, what, we ask, are to become of our boasted principles of republicanism?

Did our venerated fathers, in the war of independence, think that they “had passed the period of abstract rights?” Did they receive without question the decisions of Lord Mansfield and Lord North, relative to colonial dependence and obligation? The war

of '76 was emphatically a war of principles against acts of usurpation. It was the struggle, the desperate and successful struggle, of natural justice, against the tyranny of *expediency and authority*. Our fathers fought, not for what they had suffered, but for what they feared. In the strong metaphor of Edmund Burke, "they snuffed the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze." What would they have answered, if the British Government had told them, that they had long since passed the period of abstract rights, and therefore, must submit to the laws of expediency and authority, as well as of natural justice? This would have been their answer: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are born free and equal; that their Creator has endowed them with certain unalienable rights; that among these rights are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness."

What if the Holy Alliance should issue a proclamation to the people of the United States, declaring our republic an intolerable nuisance to monarchy—"rei inter Deos hominesque pulcherrimæ?" How would such a proclamation be received? And suppose their European majesties should send a half million of soldiers to reduce us to submission? Who among us would acquiesce in the *will of the strongest*, on the ground that "political questions, involve considerations of expediency and authority, as well as of natural justice?"

We had thought it was our high privilege to fall upon times, when the transactions of governments are to be tried by the criterion of abstract rights—by those principles of justice which God and nature have written in characters of light upon every leaf of the great charter of human liberty. We had thought it was the grand distinction—the peculiar glory of our age, that *force* was no longer to be considered *right*. And never, until the commencement of the outrageous warfare which has been waged upon the weak and defenceless Indians of the South, did we suppose it possible, that an American citizen would be so recreant to liberty, as to vindicate a line of conduct, which in a Napoleon, or a Tamerlane, or an Attila, is held up to everlasting abhorrence and execration. The descendants of those, who, for a paltry tea-tax, hazarded everything in a war "at fearful odds," are the last on earth, who should lord it over their fellow men. "The American people say, that they love liberty. They talk much about it. They boast of their own liberty. Why will they take it from the red men?" Who can answer the noble chief?

We marvel not, however, that those who deny the Indian title of jurisdiction, shrink from the abstract principles of justice, and attempt to stigmatize those, who defend the claim of the Indians by arguments founded upon such principles—as "speculative politicians," "bewildering themselves in metaphysical subtleties." These "metaphysical subtleties" are the plain, common-sense maxims, for which our fathers gave their treasure and their blood.

They are the earliest and the latest lessons in our schools of patriotism. The opposers of the Indian title know full well that they cannot stand in the blaze of celestial truth; and that they dare not meet the withering frown of insulted justice.

It is possible that some may yet contend for the sovereignty of the United States over the Indian lands, by virtue of the charters which were given to the colonists.—But there is a previous question to be settled. Whence did the monarchs of England derive the power to give such charters? Have inhabitants of newly discovered countries *no rights*? Are they to be treated like wild animals? to be killed or spared at pleasure? to be molested or unmolested in their habitations, as may be agreeable to the sovereign will of the strongest? Who gave the king of England authority, by a *dash of his pen*, to extinguish the Indian title of sovereignty? The kings of Europe and the Pope of Rome had no more title to lands in America than they had to lands in the moon. The charter by which the Aborigines held this country was of higher authority than that of the European colonists. It came not from a mere show of mortality, glittering with the stars of regal magnificence, but from the King of kings, the Lord of lords. It came not from the prince of the “sea-girt isle,” but from the eternal Sovereign of the universe.

Vattel, and others who have written upon natural law, have indeed maintained that a savage, migratory people have no right to possess a large territory, to the exclusion of civilized men. Now, although we believe this doctrine originated in the brains of philosophers, who were ready to indite a song of adulation to some pageant of royalty, or were anxious to furnish some plausible pretext for the usurpations by which European governments had deprived many of the natives of this continent of their dearest rights, we are willing to concede, that civilization may have a superior claim to barbarism in respect to territory. But conceding that the Aborigines had no right to exclude European colonists from these shores, does it follow that they had no title to *a part of the country*? If they had not an unquestioned title to *the whole*, had they no title to *any*?—We sincerely hope the North American Reviewer will consider this question, before he attempts to impose upon the community another elaborate sophism, in the disguise of an argument from natural law.

When our ancestors came and settled around the Indians, or in the midst of them, they did not say to the noble sons of the forest, ‘You have no right to this country—we are the lords of the soil, but we will allow you to reside here for the present.’ No. Their language was, ‘The land is yours—you have more than you need—we can all live here in peace and comfort—sell us a part, and we will pay you your price.’ This was the uniform language of the settlers. They treated the Indian tribes as

independent nations, and always negotiated with them as independent nations. They had charters or patents from Great Britain; but these they never employed in their intercourse with the natives. The charters and patents of the colonists did not in the least affect their relations to the Indians, but the relations of themselves to other colonists from Great Britain, and from the continent of Europe.

How different the language and conduct of some of their descendants! Could the Indians of 1630 have anticipated the situation of their posterity in 1830, not a white man would have been suffered to breathe, from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico. Had our ancestors whispered a remote allusion to such doctrines as now come forth from our National Executive, and find a vindication in one of the first literary journals of the United States, that whisper would soon have been silenced forever by the monitory notes of the war-whoop, and the deadly blows of the tomahawk. Had the Creeks and the Cherokees of 1733 been endowed with a spirit of prophecy, Oglethorpe and his companions would never have been received to the bosom of their hospitality. Little did they imagine, when they resigned to the founder of the State of Georgia, by amicable treaty, a portion of their lands, that they were affixing the seal to the political death-warrant of their own children. Much less than a century since, the Cherokees could have swept from the earth the ancestors of the very men who are now plotting their expatriation—their banishment from their hunting-grounds and their cultivated fields—from the homes, the council-fires, and the sepulchres of their fathers. They had the power, but they used it not. They received the settlers with open arms; for they had never read the story of the reptile, who repaid his benefactor by stinging him to the vitals.

It has been said that the Indian title has been considered a title of *occupancy*, not of sovereignty; and some decisions of courts have been cited in proof of this assertion. Admit the doctrine—what then? The *slave-trade*, with all its abominations, was once sanctioned by law. Now, it is **PIRACY**. Courts of justice have no power to legislate. Their office is to interpret and apply the statutes enacted by the proper authorities. And if the parliament of Great Britain, previous to our independence, or the American Congress, since that period, had passed a law annihilating the Indian title of sovereignty, it would still remain a most important question, or rather, it could hardly be a question, whether the act was not a direct infringement of that constitution which Heaven gave to all the nations of the earth. It is in vain to plead the right of discovery, the superiority of civilization over barbarism, and the policy of European nations in regard to the original inhabitants of the new world. It is worse than in vain to adduce

the cardinal maxim of despots, that "force becomes right." Five years since, we should have said without hesitation, that the American who recognized this maxim, in any sense, might properly be considered as a candidate for a cell among the lunatics in a hospital.

But what is the simple truth in regard to this matter of occupancy?—Provision has been made by the General Government, in regard to the possession and jurisdiction of the Indian reservations, within the chartered limits of the States—in the event of a legitimate extinguishment of the Indian title. Hence the States have a sort of reversionary interest in these lands, so far as jurisdiction is concerned; and, in the case of Georgia, the reversionary interest embraces the property of the soil, in consequence of the compact of 1802. But the Indians have never been under the least obligation to relinquish their title. Unless, therefore, they make a voluntary relinquishment, those who hold this reversionary interest—this misnamed *seizin in fee*—have no right to advance any claim upon the soil or the jurisdiction of the Indian territory, *until time shall be no more*. Still, as many have anticipated the ultimate extinguishment of the Indian title, contracts have sometimes been made, and cases have occurred, involving questions which have been submitted to courts of justice. Our limits will not allow us to go into detail upon this point. Whoever wishes to see what has been decided by courts relative to the civil position of the Indians, will obtain abundant satisfaction by referring to the Appendix to the articles of "William Penn." The decisions of Chief Justice Marshall and Chancellor Kent are entirely at war with every pretension of right on the part of the United States, or of an individual State, to take forcible possession of any portion of the Indian territory, or to exercise jurisdiction over the inhabitants. Chancellor Kent's decision in the case of *Goodell vs. Jackson*, may be safely recommended to all whose minds may have been misled by the sophistries of the North American Reviewer. And we must be allowed to request the reviewer himself to be candid enough, when he writes again, to inform his readers that the New York decision, to which he refers with so much complacency, was, as he probably knows, overruled by the illustrious author of the "Commentaries upon American Law." According to this distinguished jurist, the Indians of New York have always been separate communities, independent of the jurisdiction of the State and of the National Executive. All that he has said of the title of the Six Nations to their soil and sovereignty, nay, much more, can be urged in favor of the validity of the title of the Cherokees and other tribes of the South.

To contend that the Cherokees have a title to soil, but not to jurisdiction, is an outrage upon common sense. Soil and jurisdiction are inseparably allied. This we hold to be a fundamental

article in the law of nations. And we know not why the Indians should be treated as an "anomaly," when this article is to be applied. But waiving this consideration entirely, the whole discussion relative to the title of the Cherokees to the exclusive occupancy of their soil, and the independent administration of their government, may be brought into a narrow space. The tenure of occupancy is *unlimited*—it is FOREVER. It is so recognized and so guaranteed by treaties. These same treaties have also recognized the Cherokees as a distinct sovereign people, and pledged the good faith of the United States as a security against all encroachment upon their rights. If the treaties do not contain such a recognition, and such a pledge, then they are all a mockery. Now, as the constitution of the United States declares treaties to be the *supreme law of the land*, and requires *the judges of every State to be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of that State to the contrary notwithstanding*, it plainly follows, that no legislature, and no judiciary, have authority to make enactments and pronounce decisions, which contravene the stipulations of treaties regularly made and regularly ratified. All opinions of judges and counsellors, therefore, so far as they affect the rights of the Indians, must be considered correct or incorrect, according to their agreement or disagreement with TREATIES—THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. And if it could be proved conclusively, that other States had legislated for the Indians, *as their subjects*, the Cherokees could still appeal from the legislation of Georgia, to the tribunal of natural justice, and to the solemn obligations of that SUPREME LAW, to which Georgia, as a member of the Union, has pledged obedience.

It appears from the President's message, and from a communication of the Secretary of War, that the Cherokees have given special umbrage to the Executive, in consequence of an alleged encroachment upon the constitution of the United States. They are said to have established an independent government within the limits of a sovereign State—an *imperium in imperio*—thus infringing upon that article, which provides that no new State shall be formed within another State. The Cherokee government, therefore, must be abolished.—None but a bad cause would ever have resorted to such a pitiful sophism. *Have not the Cherokees always had an independent government?* If not, who have governed them? Have the people of Georgia, or the people of the United States? Surely not. They have been governed by their own laws and their own chiefs. Within a few years, they have *changed the form* of their government; but to pretend that they have now been establishing a government in Georgia—an *imperium in imperio*—when they have merely *changed the form* of a government which they have had and exercised from time immemorial, is preposterous.

But in regard to this *imperium in imperio*—this Gorgon which has of late so marvellously troubled the imaginations of some of our public men, what evils has it hitherto occasioned? For more than forty years, the Cherokees have been at peace with the United States, and are likely to remain so from age to age, unless they are wantonly molested. And if great and distressing evils existed in consequence of their situation in the midst of the whites, *who should remove?* The Georgians, or the Cherokees? The Georgians settled around them, not they in the midst of the Georgians. Hence the Indians are the last that should suffer. There is, however, not the least necessity of collision from the geographical positions of the two parties. The Cherokees have land enough for their accommodation, as an independent, flourishing community; although they possess but a miserable pittance in comparison with the territory of Georgia. And if the Georgians wish for more land, let them find it beyond the Mississippi.

What possible danger is to be apprehended from the Cherokees, living, as they do, remote from the dense settlements of the whites? And what would be gained, in respect to the *imperium in imperio*, if they should remove to the west? Will they not again be surrounded by a white population, and again frighten the Executive by this terrible Gorgon?

If we may judge from opinions which have been expressed, many seem to overlook entirely the question of *right*, in respect to the title of the Indian lands, and are willing that measures should be employed to affect a removal of the inhabitants, because they think such removal would be a *benefit to the Indians themselves*. We do wish that all who think thus, would reflect upon a late declaration of a Senator of Missouri: "I hold it to be a sound moral principle, that it is not *right* to inquire into the *expediency* of doing *wrong*." The Indians have in their own hands the decision of the question, whether they will, or will not remove. We may think a removal would promote their peace and prosperity. If so, we may *advise* them to emigrate. But all *compulsion*, whether it be by military operations or by oppression and intolerable legislative enactments, is unwarrantable and atrocious.

It is sufficient for us, *that the Indians are opposed to a removal*. We are aware, that Col. McKenney, as quoted in the N. A. Review, asserts the contrary; and we have no doubt, that much false information on this point has been communicated to the Executive. The editor of the Cherokee Phoenix has given Col. McKenney such a reply to his statements, as we presume he will not very soon forget. The plain truth is, that for many years, U. S. Agents have been laboring to persuade the Cherokees to remove. Argument and intreaty—figures of speech and figures of arithmetic—pathos of emotion and pathos of gold—have been most liberally and earn-

estly employed; and yet the Cherokees are immoveable. How then can the officers of our government any longer be deceived? Why will they not take the testimony of the Cherokee memorial to the present Congress? Why will they continue to delude themselves with the idle fiction, that the great body of the people are so much in awe of a few "powerful chiefs," that they dare not speak out the real wishes of their hearts?—Again and again, has the voice of this afflicted, persecuted community, been reiterated with thundering emphasis: "WE WILL NOT REMOVE;—WE LIVE ON THE SOIL OF OUR FATHERS, AND HERE WE ARE RESOLVED TO FIND OUR GRAVES."

It is sufficient, we have said, that they are opposed to a removal. It is more than sufficient, that they are opposed, for the best possible reasons. So far as any country has been designated for their future residence, it is a country which has been pronounced by an United States' Agent, to be uninhabitable by a people who wish to devote themselves to agriculture. It consists chiefly of prairies—almost entirely destitute of wood and water. The country has also been explored by some Chickasaw Indians, who are willing to emigrate, provided a suitable territory can be furnished. Their testimony agrees entirely with the representations of Major Long. The astonishing truth is, that notwithstanding all that has been said on the subject of lands for the Indians across the Mississippi, *the United States have not at their disposal a suitable tract of country where the Southern tribes could be colonized.* There is indeed "an ample district west of the Mississippi," but nearly all that would answer the purposes of the people in question, is either pre-occupied,—or is subject to Indian titles unextinguished,—or lies in a latitude which would be destructive to Indians who have been inured to a Southern climate! Besides, if the territory offered the Indians was as eligible as any portion of the U. S., if a fair equivalent was paid for all improvements on their present soil, even then, a removal would be attended with immense sacrifices. The plan of the Executive embraces the removal of not less than 60,000 souls. The Secretary of War estimates them at 75,000. Think now of the emigration of 60,000 people—"from helpless infancy to the decrepitude of age"—to a wilderness, many hundred miles distant from their present abode! Think of the emigration of all the inhabitants of Essex or Suffolk county, to a vast region of prairies,—there to erect habitations and cultivate the ground for subsistence! Dwell upon the scene—and no language can portray its horror.

By a singular coincidence, the same Number of the Review which contains the article upon which we have animadverted, presents us with a most affecting picture of the sufferings of the Acadians, who were barbarously expelled from Nova Scotia. We should think that every man; who should read the article upon *Haliburton's History of Nova Scotia*, before or after perusing that

which precedes in the order of arrangement, would find it impossible to sympathize with the cold-blooded vindication of the cruel and inhuman project for the "*Removal of the Indians.*" We ought, perhaps, in justice to the reviewer, to mention for the information of those who have not read his article, that he seems to have a little relenting, as he approaches the conclusion of his work.

"After all," he says "it cannot be denied, and ought not to be concealed, that in this transplantation from the soil of their ancestors to the plains of the Mississippi, some mental and corporeal sufferings await the emigrants. These are inseparable from the measure itself."

His feelings soon become so tender upon the occasion, that he sheds some very pretty classical tears. He then proceeds :

"Although the Indians are migratory in their habits, yet their local attachments are strong and enduring. *The sepulchres of their fathers* are as dear to them, as they ever were to the natives of the East. Those ties have bound them to their native regions longer and stronger than any other, or all other considerations."

If these things are true of the degraded savages, with whom the writer has been conversant, how much more of intensity should be added to his remarks, when they are applied to the *Cherokees*,—a people, not like the Sacs, and Winnebagoes—but who have houses, and farms, and plantations. How do the Indians of the South contemplate the prospect of a removal?—"We are told that the white man is about to bring his laws over us. We are distressed. Our hands are not strong. We are a small people. The white man has strong arms, many warriors, and much knowledge. He is about to lay his laws upon us. *We are distressed.* O that our great father would love us ! O that the white man would love us !"

It is truly astonishing that the Executive of the U. S. should suppose it practicable to colonize the Indian tribes, under such circumstances as would furnish the least hope of their future prosperity. To bring together into a new country, 60,000 Indians, of different tribes, of different languages, of different habits, and different prejudices, with the design of "teaching them the arts of civilization, and by promoting union and harmony among them, to raise up an interesting commonwealth, destined to perpetuate the race, and to attest the humanity of this government"*—appears to us, when viewed in reference to political sagacity, to be the most insane and ridiculous project, which was ever conceived by rational men. But if the trial of its feasibility would be as harmless as some other vagaries of Quixotism have been, we should not feel the painful solicitude that we now feel. Should the wishes of the Executive be so far carried into effect, as to secure an emigration of the Indians, the world will witness an appalling spectacle of confusion, and anarchy, and wretchedness. If the government wish the Indians to be taught the arts of civilization, and exhibit to the

* President's Message.

world a perpetual attestation of our humanity, no means whatever will be used to disturb them in their present abodes. The Cherokees have already "an interesting commonwealth." Many across the Atlantic have listened with admiration to the story of their advances in civilization and Christianity. Nay more, they have seen with their own eyes: for the press of New Echota has sent them the memorials of its existence and influence.—The other tribes are in the same path of improvement. Schools are in successful operation among the Choctaws and Chickasaws. And even the Creeks have of late inclined their ears to the sound of instruction. Hundreds among these tribes give the most convincing evidence, that they worship the "Great Spirit," in spirit and in truth. In a word, the winter of barbarism is past. The spring of civilization is approaching the summer, and the genial plants are putting forth their blossoms in beauty and fragrance. Shall they be torn up by the roots and transported to a *barren prairie*?

We would now invite the attention of our readers to a few extracts from articles, furnished but a short time since, by the same reviewer for the same journal, which has of late given its editorial sanction to doctrines, which would find a more congenial atmosphere in Constantinople than in Cambridge.

In the N. A. Review, for January, 1826, the writer comments upon the plan of the colonization of the Indian tribes:

"We have serious apprehension, that in this gigantic plan of public charity, the magnitude of the outline has withdrawn attention from the necessary details, and that, if it be adopted, to the extent proposed, it will exasperate the evils that we are all anxious to allay." p. 116.

Again: "It is no slight task for a whole people, from helpless infancy to the decrepitude of age, to abandon their native land, and seek in a distant, and perhaps barren region, new means of support." p. 117.

☞ "A cordon of troops, which might encircle each tribe, might keep them all in peace together. But without such a display of an overwhelming military force, we should soon hear, that the war-dance was performed, the war-song raised, and that the young men had departed in pursuit of fame, scalps and death." p. 118.

In the number for April, 1827, the same writer, after a very respectful notice of "the missionary establishments for the colonization of Indian youth," adverts to the "scheme for removing the Indians to the country west of the Mississippi." Though he does not here discuss the merits of the "scheme," it is obvious, that his views had experienced no change. "The magnitude of the subject is imposing, and its possible consequences APPALLING. Doubts and difficulties surround the question."

Those who have read his recent article, are aware, that he now warmly advocates the necessity of the execution of this scheme of removal. He appears not to have entirely forgotten his former sentiments; but his "doubts have gradually given way before the experiments he has seen, and before the imposing circumstances which have gathered around the controversy."

Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis. The reviewer has changed his opinions ;—whether from principle, or inter st, we leave to all who know his history, to decide for themselves. We do not know, that “ the possible consequences” of a removal of the Indians, are less “ appalling” than they were in 1827. Neither do we know, that there is any less necessity for “ a cordon of troops” around each tribe, “ to keep them in peace together.” Truly, the “ searching operation” has a marvellous influence in changing opinions, as well as places.

If others were effected, as we were, by the reviewer’s quotations from Mr. McCoy’s “ Remarks on Indian Reform,” they will be somewhat surprised to find, that he differs from this reviewer, in almost every point. The reviewer denies the validity of the Indian title. But Mr. McCoy contends, “ that the justice of their claims to the soil they inhabit is not inferior to the most righteous and undisputed title, that any people in any part of the earth, ever preferred to a portion of it.” The reviewer speaks of the Indians as “ holding with a death-grasp to their old institutions.” But Mr. McCoy thinks “ it the misfortune of the Indians, that their white neighbors have generally supposed them to be inflexibly attached to their huntings and wild customs.” The reviewer attributes the failure of efforts to civilize the Indians, to something peculiar to their nature. Mr. McCoy attributes it to the conduct of the whites. The reviewer speaks of the Cherokees as a most wretched race. But Mr. McCoy, in comparing the Indians of the north with those of the south, inquires : “ Can anything in nature be more plain and convincing, than the striking contrast between the miserable wretches on small reservations, or those on our frontiers—and those flourishing countries, towns and villages, which are inhabited by Cherokees ?”

The reviewer takes all the Indians of the north and the south, gives them the same general character, and would sweep them all away with the same besom of removal. But Mr. McCoy, who, the reviewer himself being judge, “ is an able and dispassionate laborer in the great field of aboriginal improvement,” and “ has a right to speak on this subject,”—after expressing his decided disapprobation of the general policy of the government towards the Indians, furnishes us with a testimony, which merits very special consideration. We should like to see the reviewer grapple with this passage :

“ We are now admonished, in terms clear and distinct, the language of well known facts, *what we ought not to do.* The question, therefore, presents itself singly, *What ought we to do ? Let the history of the Cherokees and their neighbors teach us.* Unless we colonize these people, (the Indians on the small reservations of the north,) and place them in circumstances similar to those of the Cherokees, they must inevitably perish.”*

* Mr. McCoy, however, with what consistency let the public judge, recommends the removal of the Cherokees. His arguments are the “ *imperium in imperio,*” and “ the only hope of averting the stroke which threatens the existence of their nation.”

We are reminded, in this connexion, of one illustration of the reviewer's *tact*, which we might have noticed at an earlier stage of this discussion. Speaking of the Cherokees and other southern tribes, he says,

"Many of them exhibit spectacles as disgusting as they are degrading. Only three years since, an appropriation was made by Congress, upon the representations of the authorities of Florida, to relieve the Indians there from actual starvation."

Now what confidence can the community repose in the writer of this extract? The statement either proves his consummate ignorance of facts, or his wanton perversion of them. Who were the Indians thus relieved from starvation? They were *Seminoles*, whom our government had persuaded to emigrate. Their "land of promise" was thus described by Wm. O. Duval, the Governor of Florida, who explored it in 1826.

"I have never seen a more wretched tract of country, than that which I entered five or six miles south of Chucicchatty—the sand hills rise very high, and the Indian trail winds over an extensive sand ridge, for eight or nine miles; the whole of the timber for this distance, as far as the eye can survey, has been killed by fire; the burnt and blackened pines, without a leaf, added to the dreary poverty of the land, presents the most miserable and gloomy prospect I ever beheld. After descending the southern extremity of this ridge, I entered a low, wet, piney country, spotted with numerous ponds. So low was the whole country, as far as the Indian boundary extended towards Tampa Bay, that after riding all day and until eleven o'clock at night, in the hope I would find a dry spot to sleep upon, I was compelled to take up my lodging on a low wet place for the night. No settlement can be made in this region, and there is no land in it worth cultivation. The best of the Indian lands are worth but little; nineteen twentieths of their whole country within the present boundary, is by far the poorest and most miserable region I ever beheld."

Such was the report of Gov. Duval to the Indian Department, on the subject of the miseries of the emigrant *Seminoles*! And shall "disgusting and degrading spectacles," which have been produced by the measures of our own government, be cited by an apologist for Georgia and the national Executive, in proof that the Cherokees, as well as the other southern tribes, are a most miserable race? When shall the unfortunate Aborigines receive justice at our hands? Is it not enough, that we dislodge them from their "goodly heritage," and drive them into swamps and deserts? Must we reproach them for their poverty and debasement,—that poverty and debasement which we ourselves have wantonly and barbarously occasioned?—Shall we pour unmingled gall into their cup of sorrow, and then make their very misery an argument for additional cruelties and insults? "*He must be worse than savage, who can view with cold indifference an exterminating policy.*"*

The reviewer was once commenting upon a passage, that suggested to him a remark, which we think might be very aptly applied, not only to statements respecting the Cherokees, but to the general

* Report of Committee on Indian Affairs, to Congress, March 23, 1824.

tenor of this elaborate article. "In all of this, there is enough of truth, to elude the charge of deliberate falsehood, and yet so much of error as to present a result, *utterly fallacious*." (N. A. Review, April, 1827.)

SELECTIONS.

DEFENCE OF JONAH'S HISTORY. JON. i. 17, ii. 1—10. *Abridged from King's 'Morsels of Criticism.'*

The history of Jonah, though by some carped at and turned into ridicule, contains nothing inconsistent with the soundest philosophy and experience. For,

1. Though a whale, properly so called, has so small a gullet that it could not possibly swallow a man, yet we ought to consider, that the original word does not necessarily mean a whale, as distinguished from other large fishes, but only a great sea monster, of which there are some, the shark among the rest, very capable of swallowing a man whole, and which have done so. A very remarkable fish was taken on our own coast, though probably it was not of the full size, and therefore could not contain the body of a man. But others of its species very well might. A print, and curious description of it, by Mr. James Ferguson, may be seen, (Philosophical Transactions, vol. liii. p. 170,) from which even this small one appears to have been near five feet in length, and of great bulk, and to have been merely, as it were, one vast bag, or great hollow tube, capable of containing the body of any animal of size that was in some small degree inferior to his own. And unquestionably such a kind of fish, and of still larger dimensions, may, consistently even with the most correct ideas of any natural historian, be supposed to have occasionally appeared in the Mediterranean, as well as on our coasts, where such a one was caught, having come up so far as into the Bristol Channel, and King's Road.

2. A man may continue in the water, in some instances, without being drowned. Derham tells us (Physico-Theology, b. 4, cap. 7, note, p. 158, 159; 12mo,) that some have the *foramen ovale* of the heart remaining open all their lives, though in most it is closed very soon after birth; and that such persons as have the *foramen ovale* so left open could neither be hanged nor drowned; because, when the lungs cease to play, the blood will nevertheless continue to circulate, just as it does in a foetus in the womb. Though Mr. Cheselden doubted of this fact, yet Mr. Cowper the anatomist says, he often found the *foramen* open in adults, and gives some curious instances. Mr. Derham mentions several persons who were many hours and days under water, and yet recovered; and one, who even retained the sense of hearing in that state. And Dr. Platt, (History

of Staffordshire, p. 292,) mentions a person who survived and lived, after having been hanged at Oxford for the space of twenty hours, before she was cut down. The fact is notorious; and her pardon, reciting this circumstance, is extant on record. See Ray on the Creation, p. 230, who observes, that having the *foramen ovale* of the heart open, enables some animals to be amphibious. Where then is the absurdity in conceiving, that Jonah might have been a person of this kind, having the *foramen ovale* of his heart continuing open from his birth to the end of his days, in which case he could not be drowned, either by being cast into the sea, or by being swallowed up by the fish?

3. Neither could Jonah be injured by the digesting fluid in the fish's stomach; for Mr. Jo. Hunter observes (Philosophical Transactions, vol. lxii. p. 449,) "that no animal substance can be digested, by the digesting fluid usually existing in animal stomachs, while life remains in such animal substances. Animals (says he,) or parts of animals, possessed of the living principle when taken into the stomach, are not in the least affected by the powers of that viscus, so long as the animal principle remains. Thence it is, that we find animals of various kinds living in the stomach, or even hatched or bred there. But the moment that any of these lose the living principle, they become subject to the digestive powers of the stomach. If it were possible for a man's hand, for example, to be introduced into the stomach of a living animal, and kept there for some considerable time, it would be found that the dissolvent powers of the stomach could have no effect upon it; but if the same hand were separated from the body, and introduced into the same stomach, we should then find that the stomach would immediately act upon it. Indeed, if this were not the case, we should find, that the stomach itself ought to have been made of indigestible materials; for if the living principle were not capable of preserving animal substances from undergoing that process, the stomach itself would be digested. But we find, on the contrary, that the stomach, which at one instant, that is, while possessed of the living principle, was capable of resisting the digestive powers which it contained, the next moment, viz. when deprived of the living principle, is itself capable of being digested, either by the digestive powers of other stomachs, or by the remains of that power which it had of digesting other things."—Consistently with which observations of Mr. Hunter, we find, that smaller fishes have been taken alive out of the stomachs of fishes of prey, and (not having been killed by any bite or otherwise) have survived their being devoured, and have swam away well recovered, and very little affected by the digesting fluid. Two instances of this kind are mentioned by Dr. Platt, (History of Staffordshire, p. 246;) and others might be added.

There appears, therefore, nothing unphilosophical, or absurd, in supposing that Jonah (or indeed any other man having the *foramen ovale* of the heart open, or such a construction of his frame as those persons mentioned by Derham had,) might be cast into the sea, and be swallowed up whole by a great fish, and yet be neither drowned, nor bitten, nor corrupted, nor digested, nor killed; and it will easily

follow, from the dictates of common sense, that in that case the fish itself must either die, or be prompted by its feelings to get rid of its load; and this it perhaps might do more readily near the shore, than in the midst of waters; and in that case, such person would certainly be recovered again, by degrees, and escape. I acknowledge, there must have been a miraculous divine interposition in causing all the circumstances of the presence of the fish, of the formation of Jonah, and of the nearness of the shore at the time of his being thrown up, to concur rightly, to effect his deliverance; and how much the miraculous interposition might extend, we cannot, and ought not to presume to ascertain: but solely to show the fact to be philosophically possible, according to the experience we are permitted to be acquainted with, is sufficient to remove, and fully to answer, the objections of scoffers.

GENEVA.

The Papal authority was abolished at Geneva, and the Reformation proclaimed, A. D. 1535. The celebrated John Calvin, passing through the city on a journey, the following year, was induced to make it his permanent abode. With various vicissitudes, especially during the early part of his ministry, he remained here till his death, in 1566. His counsel and aid were often sought and imparted in modelling the reformed churches in other places; but Geneva was the centre of his immediate influence. Here, as has been well observed "he was the light of the church, the oracle of the laws, the supporter of liberty, the restorer of morals, and the fountain of literature and the sciences. To him, the Genevese owe the establishment of their University and schools, which have enabled them to furnish to every country in Europe so many instructors and men of science."

We propose to offer the testimony of distinguished men, eye-witnesses, as to the moral and religious state of Geneva at different periods. The first is that of John Knox, in 1557, after a residence in that city of about two years. "So much was he pleased with the *purity of religion* established" there, "that he warmly recommended it to his religious acquaintances in England, as the *best Christian asylum to which they could flee*."

"In my heart," says he to a Mr. Locke, "I could have wished, yea, and cannot cease to wish, that it might please God to guide and conduct yourself to this place, where I neither fear nor eshame to say, *is the most perfect school of Christ that ever was in the earth, since the days of the Apostles*. In other places, I confess Christ to be truly preached; but MANNERS AND RELIGION SO SINCERELY REFORMED, I have not yet seen in any other place beside."*

In 1685, after the lapse of more than a hundred years, in which time the doctrine and discipline of Calvin might be expected to produce their legitimate effects, the celebrated Bishop Burnet visited Geneva. The following is his account of the place.

* Letters, p. 377.

Geneva is too well known to be much insisted on. It is a little State ; but it has *so many good constitutions in it*, that the greatest may justly learn of it. The chamber of the corn has always two years' provision for the city in store, and forces none but bakers to buy it at a taxed price ; and so it is both necessary against any extremities under which the State may fall, and is likewise of great advantage ; for it gives a good yearly income, that has helped the State to pay nearly a million of debts contracted during the wars : and the citizens are not oppressed by it ; for every inhabitant may buy his own corn as he pleases, only public houses must buy from the chamber. And if one will compare the faith of *Rome* and *Geneva* together in this particular, he would be forced to prefer the latter : for if *good works* are a strong presumption, if *not* a sure indication, of a *good faith*, then *justice* being a good work of the first form, *Geneva* will certainly carry it. If the public makes a moderate gain on the corn, that, and all the other revenues of this small commonwealth, are so well employed, that there is no cause of complaint given in the administration of the public purse, which, with the advantages that arise out of the chamber of the corn, is about one hundred thousand crowns revenue. But there is much to go out of this ; three hundred soldiers are paid, an arsenal is maintained, that in proportion to the State is the greatest in the world, for it contains arms for more men than are in the State : there is a great number of ministers and professors, in all twenty-four, paid out of it, besides all the public charges and officers of the Government. The salary for the professors and ministers is indeed small, not above two hundred crowns ; but to balance this (which was a more competent provision when it was first set off a hundred and fifty years ago, the price of all things and the way of living being now much heightened) those employments are held in their due reputation, and the richest Citizens in the town breed up their children so as to qualify them for those places. And a minister that is suitable to his character is thought so good a match, that generally they have such estates, either by succession or marriage, as support them suitably to the rank they hold. And in *Geneva* there is so great a regulation upon expenses of all sorts, that a small sum goes a great way. It is a surprizing thing to see so much learning as one finds in *Geneva*, not only among those whose profession obliges them to study, but among the magistrates and citizens ; and if there are not many men of the first form of learning among them, yet almost everybody here has a good tincture of a learned education, inasmuch that they are masters of the *Latin*, they know history and the controversies of religion, and are generally men of good sense.

There is a universal civility, not only towards strangers, but towards one another, that reigns all the town over, and leans to an excess : so that in them one sees a mixture of a *French* openness and an *Italian* exactness ; there is indeed a little too much of the last.

The public justice of the city is quick and good, and is more commended than the private justice of those who deal in trade.

There is no public lewdness tolerated, and the disorders of that sort are managed with great address. Notwithstanding their neighborhood to the *Switzers*, drinking is very little known among them. One of the best parts of their law is the way of selling estates. A man that is to buy an estate agrees with the owner, and then intimates it to the government, who order three several proclamations to be made, six weeks one after another, of the intended sale, that is to take place on such a day : when the day comes, the creditors of the seller, if they apprehend that the estate is sold at an under-value, may out-bid the buyer ; but if they do not interpose, the buyer delivers the money to the State, who upon that give him his title to the estate, which can never be so much as brought under a debate in law ; and the price is paid into the State, and is by them given either to the creditors of the seller, if he owes money, or to the seller himself. This custom prevails likewise in *Suisse*, where also twelve years' possession gives a prescription ; so that in no place in the world are the titles of estates so secure as here.

I passed the winter at *Geneva* with more satisfaction than I had thought it was possible for me to have found anywhere out of *England*. I ought to make the most public acknowledgements possible for the extraordinary civilities that I met with in my own particular ; but that is too low a subject to entertain you with. That which pleased me most was of a more public nature : before I left *Geneva*, the number of the *English* there was such, that I found we could make a small congregation, for we were twelve or fourteen ; so I addressed myself to the council of *twenty-five*, for liberty to have our own worship in our own language, according to the best *English* liturgy. This was immediately granted in so obliging a manner, that as there was not one person that made any exception to it, so they sent one of their body to me, to let me know, that in case our number should grow to be so great that it were fit for us to assemble in a church, they would grant us one which had been done in *Queen Mary's* reign ; but till then, we might hold our assembly as we thought fit : so after that time, during the rest of my stay there, we had every *Sunday* our devotions according to the common prayer morning and evening ; and at the evening prayer I preached in a room that was indeed too large for our small company : but there being a considerable number in *Geneva* that understand *English*, and in particular some of the professors and ministers, we had a great number of strangers that met with us ; and the last *Sunday*, I gave the sacrament according to the way of the church of *England*. I shall name to you only two of their professors, that, as they are men of great distinction, so they were the persons with whom I conversed the most : the one is Mr. *Turretin*,* a man of great learning, that by his indefatigable study and labor has much worn out and wasted his strength, amidst all the affluence of a great plenty of fortune to which he was born : one discerns in him all the modesty of an humble and mortified temper, and of an active and fervent charity, proportioned to his abundance, or rather beyond it ; and there is in him such a melting zeal for religion, as the present con-

* This must have been the second Turretin.

juncture calls for, with all the seriousness of piety and devotion, which shows itself both in private conversation and in his most edifying sermons, by which he enters deep into the consciences of his hearers. The other is Mr. *Tronchin*, a man of a strong head, and of a clear and correct judgement, who has all his thoughts well digested : his conversation has an engaging charm in it, that cannot be resisted : he is a man of extraordinary virtue, and of a readiness to oblige and serve all persons, that has scarce any measures : his sermons have a sublimity in them that strikes the hearer, as well as edifies him ; his thoughts are noble, and his eloquence is masculine and exact, and has all the majesty of the chair in it, tempered with all the softness of persuasion ; so that he not only convinces his hearers, but subdues them, and triumphs over them. In such company it was no wonder if time seemed to go off too fast, so that I left *Geneva* with a concern that I could not have felt in leaving any place out of the Isle of *Britain*.

It began to be manifest, near the beginning of the last century, that the doctrine and discipline of the Genevese church, which had produced such happy effects, were likely soon to be abandoned. A repeal of the rule of the church, " by which candidates for ordination were required to subscribe to the Helvetic confession, and the decrees of the Synod of Dort, was procured in 1705." " Professor Vernet," who flourished about the middle of the last century, " published his disbelief in the Trinity, and the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. In 1757, the clergy of Geneva were represented by the French Encyclopedists, as generally rejecting these doctrines." Here then we enter on a *new order of things*, and the result of it we shall presently witness.—The following testimony is from " *Meiner's Letters on Switzerland*," published in " *Dr. Seiler of Erlangen's German Literary Journal*," for 1785.

The buildings are large and expensive, the inhabitants wealthy, and an incredible number of beautiful country-seats surround it on all sides. The civil war was less owing to a defective legislation, than to *growing depravity of manners*, both among high and low : * for even to the lower ranks has this corruption spread. The works of Voltaire and Rousseau are read in shops, manufactories, and workhouses. Perhaps the wealth which has flowed upon Geneva from her fine artists since 1738, when corporations were dissolved, and every artist allowed to follow what art he pleased, has accelerated her corruption. The strict church discipline, which Calvin introduced immediately after the Reformation, is now gone, and with it the authority of the clergy. Ladies of distinction give no signs of devotion in their church. They laugh, they talk, they adjust their dress, they flutter with their fans, as if they were in a jovial meeting. This indecent levity continued, when the young clergy-

* Here Dr. Seiler remarks : " I have had certain accounts, by private letters, that in many families of distinction, in that city, *Christianity is almost entirely neglected* : and, by modish and excessive refinement, the children are *formed to levity*, and rendered incapable of *serious religious reflection*. Hence solid and edifying preachers are despised by this race of men. Only they who bring to the pulpit master-pieces of eloquence are sometimes attended ; whose discourses are blained or praised, just as dramatic performance would be ; and hence can have little or no influence on the heart."

man went up to the pulpit, and I suppose read prayers and directions relating to the approaching communion; for through the noise I could not hear distinctly. They became more quiet and grave, when the young preacher appeared, and took occasion, from the mournful state of the town, to exhort all ranks, and especially the youth, to unity and reverence for law. Probably, however, this was more to be ascribed to the curiosity, than to the devotion of the hearers: for when the sermon was ended, in the moment immediately before communicating, the former noise and dissipation returned. Even when communicating, they could not so far govern themselves, as to suppress the appearances of prophanity and scoffing, which their former conversation had impressed on their countenances; or to avoid giving offence by assuming airs of seriousness. Formerly, adultery was considered at Geneva as a most shocking crime, and divorce was rendered as difficult as possible. Now the first is laughed at, and the second more easily and frequently obtained, than at London or Paris. Their old sumptuary laws are fallen into desuetude, and luxury grows incredibly. In twenty four families, they daily eat on silver plate; and in between three and four hundred, the turins and large dishes, though not the trenchers, are silver. The lowest ranks are mad on pomp and magnificence. Labourers will half starve themselves through the week, that they may appear genteelly dressed and travel in coach on the Sabbath. The wives of manufacturers are as elegantly attired, as ladies in Germany, when going to an assembly. An insatiable desire of making a grand appearance, is accompanied with a sordid covetousness, perhaps partly owing to the dearness of the necessaries of life, much increased by the multitude of strangers who resort to Geneva.

To this account, the translator, the late Dr. Erskine, adds,

So far as the translator knows, many of the clergy in Geneva are men of distinguished abilities, amiable characters, excellent writers on the Deistical controversy and moral subjects; and though perhaps allied to some pretended German Reformers in their Socinian and Arian tenets, yet no way tinctured with their scepticism and contempt of the Bible. Yet what a contrast between Meiner's character of the people, and that given them by Bishop Burnet in his travels, Letter from Zurich, 1685! May not this be owing to the opposing, or at least omitting in their sermons, those peculiar truths of the Gospel, by faith in which the heart is purified?"

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Natural History of Enthusiasm.* Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New York; J. Leavitt. pp. 302.

This is one of the most interesting and instructive volumes which have recently been published. The style is elegant, the subjects treated important, and the work altogether worthy the attention of the religious public. Unlike

most publications, the title is the least inviting part of it. We hope to make our readers better acquainted with it hereafter.

It will not be possible for us, without excluding more appropriate matter, to give our readers a particular account of the various sermons and pamphlets continually issuing from the press. In future, ordinarily, we shall publish only titles, with such occasional extracts and notices as may be thought interesting. The following are among the more recent publications of this description which have not been noticed in this work.

1. *A Sermon by Jacob J. Janeway, D. D., and a Charge by Rev. J. Gray, A. M.*, delivered at the ordination of Nicholas Murray, A. M., on the fourth of November, 1829. Philadelphia: Clark and Raser. pp. 32.

2. *A Sermon preached at Acworth, N. H., October 14, 1829, at the Installation of Rev. Moses G. Grosvenor, as Pastor of the Congregational Church.* By Z. S. BARTOW, Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Keene. Boston: T. R. Marvin. pp. 26.

3. *The Claims of Education Societies, especially on the Young Men of our Country.* A Sermon delivered in the First Baptist Meeting-house in Boston, November 8, 1829, before the Boston Young Men's Baptist Auxiliary Education Society. By RUFUS BARCOCK, Jr., Associate Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Salem. Boston: William Collier. pp. 24.

4. *The Safety of this Nation:* A Sermon delivered in Holliston, on the day of the Annual Thanksgiving, November 26, 1829. By CHARLES FITCH, Pastor of the Church and Society in Holliston. Boston: T. R. Marvin. pp. 14.

5. *Prospects of the Evangelical Faith in the Nineteenth Century:* A Sermon delivered at the Dedication of the Meeting-house erected by the Calvinistic Church and Society in Hardwick, Mass., Sept. 9, 1829. By JOHN WILDER, Jr. Pastor of the Congregational Calvinistic Church in Charlton, Mass. Brookfield: E. and G. Merriam. pp. 24.

6. Two Sermons,—the first entitled *National Blessings of Christianity*, delivered in the Meeting-house of the First Baptist Church and Society in Boston, on the day of public Thanksgiving, November 26, 1829;—the second entitled *Infidelity, some of its Modern Features*, delivered in the same place on the evening of Lord's Day, December 6, 1829. By CYRUS PITT GROSVENOR, Pastor. Boston: True and Green. pp. 32.

7. *The Essential Doctrines of the Gospel:* A Sermon by J. H. FAIRCHILD, Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church in South Boston. *Second Edition.* Boston: Peirce and Williams. pp. 36.

We are happy to apprise our readers of the publication of a second and cheap edition of this popular and useful Sermon. May it have a ready sale, and a more extended circulation.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1830.

NO. 4.

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE NATURAL AFFECTIONS NOT HOLINESS.

FROM an Address at the annual meeting of the Boston Sunday School Society, (Unitarian,) the following observations may be regarded as deserving particular attention. "Behold," exclaimed the speaker, "that hovel, through whose chinks the winter wind whistles. In its comfortless and single apartment, behold that wretched woman! See her wan cheek! It is a mother,—and on that miserable bed, her dying child! Its moan agonizes her heart. Hark! It asks for a drop of water to cool the raging fever; *but first, mother, kiss me.* The scene is over; the mother is childless; the spirit has gone to the throne of its Father; but it has gone *educated!* That mother, in her wretchedness and in her poverty, had yet opened a fountain of love in the heart of her child. It flowed in the desire for that caress; the fountain will flow forever; it is the water of life; it is the element of worship; it is heaven."* Here we are taught, that the *fond affection of a child for its mother*—an affection so tender and strong as to make it ask for a kiss on its dying bed, is the water of life, *the element of worship*—HEAVEN. If it is the element of worship, it is holiness. Heaven itself consists in the exercise of such affections!

Respecting Jefferson and Adams, we are told by their eulogists, "The apostles of liberty, the holy patriarchs of the revolution, have fulfilled their mission; and leaving the scene of their generous toil below, are gone above to receive their reward." Here *patriotism* seems to be presented as belonging to the element of

* Am. Jour. Ed. 1829. p. 88.

worship—as a qualification to which heaven will, undoubtedly, be granted !

In opposition to these and similar statements, wherever found, I shall undertake to maintain the following position : *Such qualities as the domestic affections, patriotic attachments, and the feelings of humanity, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian holiness.*

It is of importance, before discussing the subject in hand, that a *just definition of Christian holiness* should be given. *It consists in exercising towards God and man those affections of heart which the DIVINE LAW requires.* The standard of holiness is the law of God. No human quality is holy, which is not accordant with this standard. Now the apostle Paul assures us, that “*love is the fulfilling of the law.*”* What objects this love must embrace, and in what degrees it must be exercised, in order to be obedience to God, our Saviour has informed us in the comprehensive summary to which he reduced the divine requirements. ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind ; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’† Obedience to the divine law consists, then, in the exercise of supreme love to God, and that cordial good will towards men which places their interests on a level with our own.

It should be further remarked, *that that state of the affections in which any of the objects of heart-felt regard presented in the divine law are overlooked, is not obedience to God.* This is a statement of the highest importance in its bearing on the present subject. It is a statement which rests upon the Scriptures. ‘Who-soever,’ says the apostle James, ‘shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all ;’ for, as he proceeds to show, all the divine commands rest upon the same authority ; so that to live in habitual disobedience to any of these injunctions, is to set at naught the divine authority, and thus to show that the ‘heart is not right with God.’ That state of heart cannot be holy which, in any particular, habitually disregards the divine will.

In support of the proposition which has been announced, I observe,

I. *It is generally, perhaps universally admitted, that very estimable qualities may exist in mankind which do not imply Christian holiness.* This is evidently true of qualities merely intellectual. Who regards these qualities as having, in themselves, anything of a moral or religious nature ? Who blames the weak and ignorant for their mental deficiencies ? Who reproaches the idiot for being mindless ? The wretch who could do so would bring upon himself the abhorrence of all around him. The

* Rom. xiii. 10.

† Mat. xxii. 37.

possession of intellectual powers, in the highest degree and most polished forms, no man regards as a foundation on which *moral worth* may be justly claimed. However valuable we may regard a powerful and well disciplined mind, and large intellectual attainments, we never give them the praise of virtue. We never think of ascribing to them, in the lowest degree, any *holy* qualities. Take a poem of Burns. What beautiful forms of thought does it exhibit! What lovely images of the imagination does it present! What purity of taste and delicacy of sentiment pervades every line! And yet, alas! this very poem may be devoted to the cause of infidelity. Every attraction with which it shines may be fitted and designed to draw the reader away from God—from the path of duty, usefulness and peace. Whoever yields to its influence is undone! Will you admit that the intellectual qualities of Burns implied Christian benevolence? Surely not. No man, on account of the strength of his mind, and the richness of his intellectual furniture, can lay any claim to moral virtue.—On the ground of this statement, which none will deny, a *presumption* arises that *other qualities* may belong to the sensitive nature of mankind, of great use and singular beauty in their proper places, which may not necessarily partake of the nature of holiness. That this presumption looks to substantial truth, I shall now proceed to show, in the light of well known facts.

II. *Multiplied facts clearly show, that such qualities as the domestic affections, patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity, exist in many men, altogether separate from Christian benevolence.*

1. The first class of facts to which I would solicit attention furnishes ground for the following general statement: The qualities just specified *often not only do not reach the most important interests of the objects toward which they are directed, but are so exercised as to injure those interests.* The unerring standard of benevolence presents our *neighbor* as an object we are bound to love as we love ourselves. But what is our neighbor? What does this plain word comprehend? Clearly, the *entire being*—all the interests of a fellow man. Strip that fellow man of a part of the attributes and interests which belong to him, and he is no longer *our neighbor*—the object which the divine command requires us to love. If we overlook his *soul*, can we have a full view of our neighbor? If our regard reaches only to his body and his temporal interests, we love only a small fragment of our neighbor. We do not love the object set before us in the law of God, but only a small and comparatively unimportant part of that object. And especially let it be considered, if our regard for this fraction of our neighbor's being leads us to injure the better part of his nature and his most valuable interests, surely this regard for him cannot be obedience to the divine will. Now

this is precisely the form in which the domestic affections often appear. They only reach to the *temporal interests* of their object. For these interests the *parent* cherishes a fond regard. He is deeply anxious to promote them. For this, he spares no pains, he grudges no expense. But on the *eternal* welfare of his child—on those interests which lie beyond the grave, he refuses to expend a thought. Not a single effort does he make to secure for it the favor of God and the joys of heaven. And when that child is laid upon the bed of disease—when it is placed on the brink of eternity, the fondness of the parent becomes the deadliest injury to the child. He not only neglects himself to try to prepare it for the scenes of that world to which it is hastening, but sternly refuses to permit others to perform, in his stead, such a labor of love! Are not such facts painfully frequent? Ask those who are conversant with dying beds, and they will give an affirmative testimony fearfully strong;—they will answer *yes*, with affecting emphasis. Is domestic affection, thus exercised, obedience to God? It clearly contains not a particle of that benevolence which the divine will, expressed in the second great commandment of the law, demands.—The same remarks may be applied, with equal truth and force, to patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity. In how many instances do these most evidently reach only to the *temporal* interests of the objects which they embrace? How often are they so exercised as to injure the most valuable interests of these objects? Do those patriots who, to the extent of their influence, encourage flagrant violations of the holy Sabbath, out of regard to the temporal interests of their fellow citizens, cherish the spirit of Christian benevolence? Is it not the direct and powerful tendency of their patriotism (if patriotism it can be called,) to *injure* the highest interests of their neighbor?

2. The qualities under consideration often reach only a part of mankind.—The word neighbor, used in the second great commandment of the law, is clearly of very extensive signification. It includes every man within the circle of our acquaintance. Wherever we meet a child of Adam, we meet a neighbor. This view of the matter is fully sustained by the instructions which, on different occasions, our Saviour imparted to his followers. A Jewish lawyer once demanded of him what he should do to inherit eternal life. Our Lord referred him to the law, requiring supreme love to God, and that love to our neighbor which we cherish for ourselves, assuring him, that if he obeyed this law, he should 'live.' Upon this, the lawyer asked, 'And who is my neighbor?' To explain the meaning of this term, the Saviour related what has been called the story of the good Samaritan. He sets before us a traveller, evidently a *Jew*, who had fallen into the hands of 'thieves,' who had robbed him, and left him in the

highway, helpless with the wounds which they had inflicted. After having been cruelly neglected by two of his own countrymen—a priest and a Levite—he was found by a *Samaritan*, who had compassion on him, and at no small expense of time, labor and money, provided for his necessities.* The conduct of this Samaritan was described with a view to answer the question of the lawyer. The good Samaritan had just views of the import of the word neighbor; for the lawyer was directed to “go and do likewise.” Now let it be remembered, that between the Jews and Samaritans the most bitter enmity existed, and it will be seen that the obligations of the second great commandment bind us to regard strangers and even enemies as neighbors. In his “sermon on the mount,” too, our Lord teaches, in a very plain and impressive manner, that that affection for our fellow men which is confined to our friends, which does not reach our enemies, is worthless, and cannot receive the approbation of God.† But may not the domestic affections be exercised, when the heart is full of enmity to many of those who live beyond the limits of our families? From the Russian campaign, Napoleon returned to his palace, reeking with the blood of his enemies. His path to Moscow was strewn with murdered foes; from thence to France he was pursued by the departed spirits of his own starved, frozen army. And yet, when this destroyer of mankind had returned to his palace, to whet anew the instruments of death, his noble biographer informs us‡ that his “meeting” with the empress was “*extremely affectionate*, and showed, that amidst all his late losses, Napoleon had still domestic happiness within his reach.” In the affection which he thus expressed for his family, was there any *Christian benevolence*? any measure of obedience to the divine will? And do we not often witness instances in which persons under the influence of malice exercise the domestic affections? Do these affections, then, necessarily imply the least degree of that regard for *mankind* which places their interests on a level with our own? But nothing short of this is *holiness*. How frequently does *patriotism*, in its most striking exercises and admired forms, altogether fail of embracing the objects which the divine law requires us to love! How limited is the field in which it acts and operates! Beyond that field, how injurious is the influence it frequently exerts! And can such a sentiment be obedience to the will of him who requires us ‘to love our enemies’? Surely patriotism does not necessarily imply the lowest degree of true holy affection.

3. *The qualities in question are often visible in irrational animals.*—And here the remark may deserve attention, that mankind seem to possess estimable, amiable qualities, which may belong

* Luke x. 25—37.

† Mat. v. 44—47.

‡ Scott’s Nap. vol. v. p. 390.

solely to their animal nature, and to the present state of their being. This remark is sustained by the instruction which our Lord gave to some captious Sadduces, who were trying to embarrass Him with difficulties about the doctrine of the resurrection. They presented the case of a woman who had had seven husbands; and demanded, *whose wife* she should be in the resurrection? In reply to this inquiry, our Saviour assured them, that 'in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven.' The domestic relations, then, are not known in the future world. And if these relations are broken up by the grave, is it not reasonable to believe that other relations, equally appropriate to the present condition of the human family, may be forever dissolved by the same means? May not those *occasions*, which generally call into exercise the qualities under consideration, be confined to this world? And in the possession and exercise of these qualities, may we not be occupying ground in common with the irrational creation?

To this view of the subject, it is no sound objection, that these qualities *in mankind*, are united with *moral* attributes. I do not deny, that they *may be so exercised*, as to imply Christian benevolence. We may 'eat and drink to the glory of God.*' What then! In hungering and thirsting, do we not occupy ground in common with merely animal beings? And have the acts of gratifying hunger and quenching thirst *in themselves* any moral character? And to prove that such acts do not necessarily imply certain moral qualities, is it not a good and substantial argument, that they are put forth by creatures, destitute of a moral nature, and therefore incapable of moral qualities? And is it not a just conclusion, that in order to find moral qualities, good or bad, we MUST GO BEYOND THOSE ACTS AND EXERCISES which may be ascribed to such creatures? In other words, the question, whether a man hath Christian benevolence or not, must be determined *altogether* by reference to *other* qualities, than the domestic affections and the feelings of humanity. The affections of his heart must be accordant with the law of God, or he has no holiness.

Now it is notorious, that the brute creation often exhibit, in a high degree, and in very touching forms, most of those estimable qualities of which I here speak. What a tender and lively regard for their helpless young do they manifest! What deep pity for objects in distress do they sometimes feel! With what a generous attachment to their owners do they often appear to be moved! What uncorrupt fidelity in guarding the trust committed to them do they sometimes maintain! In witnessing these qualities in them, men are affected much in the same way, as by seeing them in their own species. I have been struck with a remark, which is

* 1 Cor. x. 31.

said to have fallen from the lips of a distinguished military officer. Walking forth upon the field of battle, in the evening of a day of bloody conflict, he saw a dog leap from the cloak of his dead master, with a piteous howl. An appeal equally thrilling to the sympathies of his heart, he declared, he had never felt before.—Our Saviour did not hesitate to illustrate his tender regard for the people of Jerusalem, by the lively and strong attachment of a hen for her young. Yet no one, I suppose, ascribes Christian benevolence—holiness of heart, to any of the irrational animals. The qualities, then, which mankind have in common with them, do not necessarily imply the least degree of holiness.

4. The qualities in question may often be *fairly traced to other motives* than obedience to the divine will.—Look at yonder father. How fondly he caresses the children, whom he affectionately calls his own! How promptly he resents whatever ill treatment they may receive! With what energy he nerves his arm to defend their rights—to cripple the hand that is stretched out to harm them! And yet this very father, so fond and affectionate, stubbornly refuses to sacrifice, for their benefit, the loathsome habit of drinking intoxicating liquor! So far from this, he eagerly and resolutely sacrifices their best interests, their highest happiness, to the gratification, on his part, of a most unnatural and ruinous propensity. Does his affectionate regard for his children necessarily imply any measure of obedience to the commands of God? Does he cherish, even toward his children, the spirit of Christian benevolence?

Any one may see, that numerous motives, besides obedience to God, may lead men to cherish and maintain such qualities as *veracity* and *honesty*. May not a shrewd and observant worldling have discovered the soundness of the maxim, that *honesty is the best policy*? And may he not, from mere worldly motives, from a regard to his present interests and reputation, act upon this maxim? Veracity and honesty he may find among the most effectual means of increasing his wealth, and brightening his fame. And while such motives *may* produce such qualities, do not multiplied facts clearly show, that these qualities are often the *actual result* of motives such as have been mentioned? How frequently, when by any means *reputation is lost*, do men cease to be honest and veracious! A very slight temptation will draw them aside from the path of rectitude.—Now, if these qualities may, and often must, be traced to other motives than obedience to the divine will, a child can see that they do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

5. The qualities under consideration often exist in mankind *separate from each other, and from other qualities, which are clearly essential to holiness*.—It is a striking remark of Dr. Paley, that “when our duties are recited” in the New Testament, “they

are put *collectively*, that is, as all and every of them required in the *Christian character*." And if we mark the bearing of express statements in the sacred volume, it will appear, with the greatest clearness, that where some features of the Christian character are wanting in any given case, no holiness exists. In the passage already quoted from the epistle of James, we are taught, that true obedience embraces *all* the divine commands; that he, who refuses to obey any one of the requisitions of the law, whatever in other respects he may seem to be, has no cordial regard to the will of God. He cannot, then, have any Christian benevolence.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, we are taught, that "Without *faith*, it is impossible to please God."* Here then, we have one trait of Christian character, so essential, that without it, that character cannot be formed. Whatever valuable and amiable qualities a person may exhibit, he cannot secure the divine approbation without *faith*. Moral worth—Christian benevolence, then, cannot exist without faith; for did they thus exist, they would certainly secure the divine approbation. Every kind and degree of moral goodness must awaken the complacency and draw forth the smiles of our heavenly Father. Hence, if His smiles are not bestowed—if His complacency is not awakened, the conclusion is inevitable, that no moral beauty is presented to His eye. But who will deny that, in multiplied instances, the amiable qualities under consideration have been exhibited by men devoid of Christian faith? Have not the most determined infidels—have not avowed atheists, often been distinguished for the exercise of the domestic affections? Have they not expressed, in attractive forms, the sentiments of humanity and of patriotism? Have they not sometimes been remarkable for honesty and veracity, in their intercourse with those around them? At the same time, they scorned and opposed the Christian religion. They trode upon the record of its truths. They reviled and persecuted its cordial and devoted adherents. They had *no faith* in the Christian revelation. Hence we have divine authority for the conclusion, that God withheld from them His approving smiles. They had no moral worth. Surely, then, the possession of such qualities as they exhibited, does not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

Let the facts, which have been given under the above particulars be now placed together; and how firm and broad a foundation do they lay for the doctrine under consideration. The qualities in hand often not only do not reach the most important interests of the object toward which they are directed, but are so exercised as to injure those interests; they reach only a part of mankind; are visible in irrational animals; may be fairly traced,

* Heb. xi. 6.

in many instances, to other motives besides obedience to God ; and often exist in mankind separate from each other, and from other qualities, which are clearly essential to holiness.

III. *The doctrine in question derives the firmest support from the sacred Scriptures.* The Apostle Paul presents a supposition, which bears with great clearness and force upon the point in hand. "*Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.*"* This statement of the Apostle could have no force—it would not be intelligible, if the feelings of humanity, and kindred qualities, necessarily implied any degree of holiness. In immediate connection, the Apostle has given at considerable length, a description of that charity, which is essential to moral goodness. Upon a single feature of this description, it may be proper to insist. "*Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.*" Here the word *truth*, is used in direct opposition to the word *iniquity* ; as in some other connections, it means *virtue* or *piety*—a state of mind, and a course of life, conformed to the divine requirements.* But how often do those, who rejoice in iniquity and loathe the truth, exhibit, in a striking manner, the domestic affections, patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity ! The sailor at his cups hears the cry of distress. His compassion is awakened. He rushes to the water's edge, and sees a child struggling with agony, in the angry surge. With a horrid oath upon his lips, he plunges into the water ; and, at the hazard of his own life, rescues that of the little sufferer. Who is not moved with admiration at such an exhibition of the feelings of humanity ! How deep and strong the tide of compassion which gushed from the sailor's heart ! And yet that sailor was a drunkard—was profane. Had he aught of that charity which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth ?—How often have those, who had been greatly distinguished for the warmth and strength of their *patriotic feelings*, been notorious for "rejoicing in iniquity." How often have they not only "cast off fear and restrained prayer," but indulged themselves in open, shameful vices ! How often have they been notorious for sabbath-breaking and profaneness ! With what eagerness have they sometimes plunged into the most loathsome excesses of dissipation and debauchery ! And will it be said in behalf of such men, that they "rejoice not in iniquity, but rejoice in the truth ?" Surely not. Then we have the decision of the Apostle Paul, that however they may be distinguished for their patriotism, (so called) they are devoid of charity—of that benevolence, without which holiness cannot exist.

There are few passages of the New Testament, more familiar than the story of *the amiable young ruler*. He was so truly amiable, as to attract the *love* of Jesus. It is clear from the connec-

* 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

* See Rom. ii. 8.

tion, that this love was awakened by the interesting qualities which the young ruler exhibited. But whether these qualities had any moral worth or implied any holiness, clearly appears from the sad conclusion of the story. "One thing," said the Saviour, "thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me." This direction was well fitted to try his character. It required him to evince, by substantial proofs, that he loved "God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself." Such a regard for God and his neighbor would certainly have insured obedience. A refusal to obey would clearly prove, that he was destitute of that benevolence in which holiness consists. But did he not refuse to obey? Hear the evangelist. "And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions." Will it be denied, that this young man loved his wealth more than God? He actually gave up the offered favor of God for the sake of keeping his possessions. With his eyes fully open to the consequences of such a choice, he preferred the service of mammon to the service of Jehovah. Now the voice of inspired Wisdom has expressly assured us, "that if any man love the world, the love of the Father is *not in him*." Did not this young man love the world—regard it as the supreme good—make it the portion of his soul? *Amiable*, he certainly was; but it is as certain, that he was devoid of Christian benevolence. Not a spark of holiness warmed his bosom. It was frozen by selfishness and worldliness.

Such are the arguments and illustrations, which support the doctrine laid down at the commencement of this discussion. If I do not entirely misapprehend their import and bearing, they clearly and decidedly prove, that the qualities under consideration, and kindred attributes, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

In review of the train of thought which has been presented, I observe,

1. That if the qualities, just examined, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence, *then their existence in human character is no just objection to the doctrine, that men by nature are wholly sinful*.—These qualities, as has been shown, do not imply any measure of holiness. In whatever form they appear, they do not meet and fulfil the demands of the divine law. What, then, if they *do* exist in human character? Can qualities, which have in themselves no moral excellence, *impart* moral excellence to the character to which they belong? How can this be? How can that be *imparted*, which is not *possessed*? Now if the qualities in question have no moral excellence in themselves, as has been proved, and can impart no moral excellence to the subject to which they belong; what just objection can be drawn

from the union of these qualities with human character, to the entire sinfulness of mankind? When a quality in the native character of man can be found, which necessarily implies any degree of holiness, then, and not till then, a substantial objection to the doctrine of man's entire depravity by nature is discovered. But nothing of this can be said of any of the qualities which belong to the native character of man.—With what propriety and truth, then, are the amiable and estimable properties of mankind—such as have been dwelt upon in this paper, urged as an objection to the doctrine, that all men by nature are wholly sinful? With equal propriety might the advocates of the native innocence of the human family point us to the athletic frames; or fine forms; or beautiful countenances; or vigorous and well furnished intellects of some of their acquaintances, as proofs, clear and decisive, that they were not altogether sinful!* You would think it a slight proof, indeed, that any one has a *powerful mind*, because he has the *frame* and the *strength* of a giant. And for this plain and sufficient reason, that such physical qualities, however valuable, do not necessarily imply intellectual strength and excellence. Equally slight, is the proof, that mankind have any *moral excellence*, because they exercise the feelings of humanity; cherish the domestic affections; or maintain in themselves what are commonly called patriotic sentiments. And for the plain and sufficient reason, that such qualities as these do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence. Objections, like that here examined, leave the doctrine of the unrenewed man's entire depravity where they found it;—*supported by the strongest testimonies of God's unerring word.*

2. *Those who deny that the qualities which have been considered have any moral worth, may, nevertheless, justly admire and reward them.*—"How early," exclaims a distinguished Unitarian,† "does the infant discover affection, attachment, gratitude, to those from whom it receives kindness! How universally is it an object of interest to those about it!—Instead of this, must it not (on the supposition of the truth of the Orthodox doctrine of depravity,) naturally be the object of aversion and disgust, and especially so to pious and virtuous persons?" To such inquiries, from whatever quarter they may come, and with whatever assurance they may be urged, a short answer is at hand. I say, then, that

* An argument such as this has actually been urged. After speaking of "the godlike capacities of human nature," Dr. Channing says, "I may be told that I dream, and that I have peopled the world with creatures of my lonely imagination. What! Is it only in dreams that BEAUTY AND LOVELINESS HAVE BEAMED ON ME FROM THE HUMAN COUNTENANCE; that I have heard tones of kindness which have thrilled through my heart; that I have found sympathy in sufferings, and a sacred joy in friendship?" "Oh no! I do not dream, when I speak of the Divine capacities of human nature." Sermon at Providence, p. 27. Cogent arguments these, to disprove the Divine testimony, that "the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil."

† Dr. Ware.

the infant, with the interesting qualities ascribed to it, need not, ought not, to be "the object of aversion and disgust to pious persons," however orthodox they may be. Had the Saviour been surrounded by all his orthodox disciples in New England, when he beheld with affectionate regard the amiable young ruler, who yet lacked the one thing needful, they might, in the strictest consistency with their religious principles, have admired whatever was estimable, and loved whatever was amiable in his character. What child does not know that an object may be justly admirable in one point of view, and justly loathsome and disgusting in another? May I not admire the exquisite skill and taste displayed in the structure of a pagan temple, while I abhor the design for which that structure was erected? May not very fine specimens of good writing be found on the pages of Paine and Hume? May I not justly admire these specimens? In one point of view, I may well call them *good* writers; in another, very *bad* writers. May not the most thorough Calvinist admire the vigorous intellect, large attainments, and correct taste of his friends, while at the same time he regards *them* as wholly sinful? Why, according to the representations of some writers, who have a high reputation for strength, acuteness, extent of information, and candor, I should suppose that the "Orthodox doctrine of depravity" implied that unrenewed men were idiots or brute beasts; nay, that rottenness had entered into their very bones! But all such representations, come from what quarter they may, are abusive falsehoods. The qualities which Dr. Ware ascribes to infants and unrenewed men, the Orthodox regard, on the most substantial grounds, as entirely distinct from holiness. They may, and they *do*, admire them, as estimable and amiable properties; but they may not, they do not, ascribe to them any *moral* worth. Moral worth, in themselves, they have none. They do not necessarily imply the smallest degree of Christian benevolence. It is a poor, stale *slander* on "the Orthodox doctrine of depravity," of which the adversaries of that doctrine ought to be ashamed, that it requires those who embrace it to regard with aversion and disgust such qualities in the human character as *have in themselves no moral properties*. Let this slander cease to be repeated. It may excite a popular odium against the truth. It may prevent, in dying sinners, a deep conviction of their guilt. It may hold them back from the cross of Christ. But those concerned in the circulation of such a slander may determine for themselves what good can come of it, to themselves, or to those who are under their influence.

3. *The possession of the qualities considered in this paper is no fair proof of Christian character.*—I know the man of whom you speak was much distinguished for his integrity, his amiableness, his public spirit. But what proof had those, who soothed his fears of the wrath of God upon his dying bed, that he was a

disciple of Jesus Christ? No other proof, alas! than what was furnished in the interesting qualities just enumerated. They ought not, then, *surely they ought not*, on such grounds, to have soothed those fears, which might have led him to the Saviour's feet. How could they see him perish in his sins, under a strange presumption that his amiable and estimable qualities would secure for him the smiles of Heaven! To higher ground than this must sinners rise, to reach the sunny region where a gracious God dispenses the smiles of his unveiled countenance. Amiable, upright, nerved by the feelings of humanity and a public spirit, we shall indeed be, if *we are Christians*. But without *higher* qualities than these, we certainly cannot be the disciples of the Saviour. We might as well hope to be admitted to the joys of the upper world on the ground of a vigorous intellect and a refined taste, as on the ground of our amiableness and integrity, our humane feelings and patriotic sentiments. Let all beware of building their house on such a sandy foundation. The storm will sweep it away. Let all hasten to that Rock which God has laid in Zion, humble themselves at the feet of the Redeemer, and hang their hopes of everlasting life upon the cross.

To the Editor of the Christian Examiner and Theological Review.

(Continued from page 86.)

Having been called to leave the city before my remarks on all the witnesses were finished, I recur to Gale, though out of place, lest, as in the case of Boston, it should be suspected that I omitted it because it is "so striking." In reply to my animadversion upon the reviewer for quoting Gale in proof of infant damnation, when the quotations do not contain the sentiment, the reviewer admits that Gale does not teach the doctrine in the passage quoted, and asserts that he did not adduce him as evidence to that point, but "quoted him as maintaining the same principles in regard to God's absolute justice as were maintained by Twiss, and for nothing else." "Nor did he give Gale's ideas of absolute justice as if that kind of justice were the rule of God's moral justice." Indeed! For what, then, were Gale's ideas given at all? for it was an act of God's moral justice which we, Calvinists, were charged with holding, viz. the actual damnation of infants; and surely a theory of *abstract right*, which was not the rule of actual administration, and which the reviewer knew was not, could have no relevancy in an argument which

respected moral justice, the rule of actual administration. True, the reviewer says, and that he did not introduce it for that purpose, but simply to show that Gale's ideas of absolute justice were just like those of Twiss. But if the ideas of Twiss were nothing to the purpose, why were they introduced, and of what use was it to give the irrelevant thoughts of either? He might as well have quoted the boundaries of the United States from one geographer, and then made a similar quotation from another, not indeed to prove infant damnation, but to show how one agreed with the other.

But the reviewer is mistaken in supposing that he did not quote both Twiss and Gale upon the supposition, at the time, that their views of absolute justice were complete logical evidence of infant damnation. For of Twiss's principles of absolute justice—the same as Gale's—he says, “They exclude still more strongly any ground upon which an exception can be made in favor of infants, thoroughly depraved as they are with original sin, so as to afford any hope that their lot may be better than that of the rest of their species.” But how could absolute justice, which is not the rule of actual administration, take away ground of favor or exclude hope from infants? A theoretical principle of abstract right in God, which is not the rule of moral justice, not the rule of his actual treatment of subjects, take away ground of favor, or exclude hope! He might as well assert that the pyramids were built by theoretical principles never reduced to practice, as that absolute justice, not a rule of administration, took away ground of favor and excluded hope. It is manifest that when he quoted Twiss and Gale, he did think that their ideas of absolute justice were illustrations of God's moral justice in the damnation of infants. This is still more apparent from his comment on Gale's ideas of absolute justice.

“ABSOLUTE JUSTICE indeed! And this doctrine has been taught by men, and has been received by men; and doctrines founded upon it, and which necessarily imply its truth, are still eagerly inculcated and greedily received; and men's understandings have been so debased, their moral sentiments have been so brutified, that they have not had enough sense or spirit, or knowledge of right and wrong, to lead them to ask in what the absolute justice of a Calvinistic God might differ from the absolute justice of the Prince of Hell!”

Did not the reviewer mean these animadversions as the application of an argument? Or were they only the spontaneous out-breakings of controversial courtesy—the breaking open of a box of ointment, very precious, to pour upon our heads, and sweeten the surrounding atmosphere, soured by Calvinistic malignity, and from which the fragrance of Unitarian charity might ascend, a grateful offering to heaven. If he saw that the quotations contained no relevant evidence, could he fail to see that, thus introduced, and thus commented on, they would be understood as an argument, and did he not intend they should be?

Will the reviewer say under his own name, "that by doctrines founded on it, (absolute justice,) and which necessarily imply its truth," he did not intend, as one of them, the doctrine of infant damnation, and that it was this doctrine of infant damnation, necessarily flowing from absolute justice, which is "still eagerly inculcated and greedily received," and which so debases and brutifies us that we cannot distinguish between the character of a Calvinistic God and the Devil? And yet he gravely affirms, that the only point of the controversy respected the opinion of writers, not living men, and that he quoted Gale on absolute justice, knowing that it had no relevancy, as evidence of infant damnation, and only to show that Gale on absolute justice agreed with Twiss on absolute justice. We are far from charging the reviewer with falsehood. We only think that, when the irrelevancy and absurdity of his reasoning is pointed out, he really forgets what he did intend, (for certainly he did not intend to reason inconclusively,) and makes explanations without refreshing his memory by a reference to the record of past intentions, which he has left behind him on the unobliterated page, and therefore falls into self-contradiction. If he would keep a memorandum of his intentions when he writes, he might find a way of escape, when pressed with difficulties, without running against himself, or might discover when silence is the least of two evils.

In reply to my former animadversions on his quotations from Gale, the reviewer gives Gale's doctrine of God's absolute justice, applied to the sufferings of Christ as an atonement for sin, in which he says, "that GOD DID, *DE FACTO*, INFLECT THE HIGHEST TORTMENTS ON AN INNOCENT, PURE, SPOTLESS CREATURE, EVEN THE HUMAN NATURE OF HIS OWN SON, is most evident."* Upon which he thus comments :

"Now 'in view of this exhibition,' we would inquire whether the 'accredited organ' of any party ever brought himself into a predicament more awkward than that in which our author now stands. Here is a doctrine which lies at the foundation of his whole system, and he not only pronounces it 'alarming and offensive,' but is exceedingly shocked, or rather 'surpassingly astonished,' that a plain statement of a leading principle involved in it, should be so cited as to imply a belief that the author of that statement was in earnest when he wrote 'the glaring passage' which contains it! From a Unitarian, who looks with horror upon the light in which the Calvinistic doctrine of atonement puts the character of God, language like this might have been expected. But we confess we were not prepared to hear it from the lips of Dr. Beecher, an Orthodox man and a Calvinist. From him we should have looked for a panegyric rather than a satire upon the glorious 'scheme of redemption.' He was taken at unawares, we admit. But this only the more strongly confirms what we have always maintained in regard to Calvinistic views of the character of God, viz. that they are utterly revolting to all the better principles of our nature, and, to an unprejudiced mind, carry their own refutation with them. Our author was in a state of astonishment—a state which does not afford the best of opportunities for the heart to hold close counsel with the

* Court of the Gentiles, Part iv. B. ii. chap. vi. § 1.

head, and he therefore uttered the honest language of his feelings, before he had considered how completely at war it was with the language of his system; and his testimony is a thousand times the more valuable for its very undesignedness."

I am not permitted to think that in giving these views of Gale, as in accordance with my own and those of the Calvinists of New England, the reviewer did not know that he misrepresented us. The views of New England divines on the atonement, differing from those of Gale, have been published for three quarters of a century, and are found in all the most approved New England writers. The difference between these and old Calvinistic writers is often recognized and correctly stated by Unitarian writers, when it is their object to prove that we are no Calvinists, or to excite a jealousy of our alleged Arminian tendencies, or to amplify the efficacy of the Unitarian philosophy in softening down the more repulsive features of our system. Did not the reviewer know that Gale's sentiments of absolute justice, applied to the atonement, do not lie at the foundation of our system? We do not hold that God, in the exercise of absolute justice, inflicted the highest torments on Christ. We hold that Jesus Christ, as the benefactor of the world, and, we doubt not, of the universe, had a right to lay down his life as a propitiation for sin, that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth—that God was competent to decide whether the substitution of his obedience and death would answer the purpose of maintaining law, while pardon should be offered and conferred upon all of the human race who should repent and believe on him; and seeing mercy and truth, public justice and forgiveness could be secured by the atonement, he had a right to accept the expiation which Jesus Christ had a right to make, and did accept it, and with his consent did lay on him the iniquity of us all—that it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and put him to grief, and to make his soul an offering for sin—that, with his own consent, he was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities—that, (according to Lowth,) the chastisement by which our peace was effected was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.

Does the reviewer mean to deny that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah had reference to Christ, or that God, for our sakes, afflicted him? Explain the matter as he may, Christ was innocent, he knew no sin; and yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him—he gave his life a ransom, a propitiation. He tasted death for every man. He gave his life for the world. Whether he saves us, as Calvinists suppose, as a proper atonement, or, as Unitarians suppose, by his example, and his testimony as a martyr, the principle in the case is the same—*'the just suffering for the unjust.'* Does the Unitarian look with horror upon this as absolute justice? Let him answer it to God, to Jesus Christ, to the Bible, to a Christian community. But if it does not include nor rest upon absolute

justice in his own case, the door by which he escapes will leave an open passage for us.

The reviewer accuses me of affecting a knowledge of Augustine by inspection, while I quoted him from Ridgely, and of attempting to conceal the fact by false references. This is quite amiable and charitable, especially, when in the midst of his reprehensions and exultations, he himself says,

"In the *Christian Examiner*, we inadvertently made, as was acknowledged in a subsequent number, an unwarranted use of this quotation. We have now corrected the error, but retain the quotation, at once as a curious illustration of Calvinism, and as throwing some light upon the passage cited from the context."

So then the reviewer, it seems, 'inadvertently made an unwarranted use of a quotation.'

But why should his kind heart refuse to me the charitable supposition of inadvertence? May I not be permitted to have frailties, as well as the reviewer? I say that I never thought of affecting the appearance of having consulted Augustine, or of concealing that I took the extract from Ridgely; and it was "inadvertence" only, that prevented a distinct recognition of the fact, as well as the mistakes of references.

In respect to the quotations themselves, as given from Augustine by the reviewer, they prove all which I quoted them to prove, viz. that he had been quoted, as if he believed that infants suffered in hell, according to the common description of it, as prepared for adult sinners. Whereas he did not, as we make him say, believe any such thing, but did believe that, though there would be fire,—the punishment of sense—it would be a "damnation the lightest of all,"—in respect to which he says, "I do not say that infants dying without Christian baptism will have so great a punishment inflicted upon them that it would be better for them if they had never been born;" (i. e.) the hell of infants may be better than non-existence, and on the whole, rather a blessing than a curse.

V. It appears, as the result of this discussion, that infant damnation has never been a received doctrine of the churches denominated Calvinistic.

To this proposition the reviewer has replied by a mass of irrelevant quotations from Calvinistic authors; as if the proposition were, that no writers of eminence have in any age taught it; and as if the opinions of authors, balanced by contrary opinions of authors, could prove a doctrine to be the received doctrine of the Calvinistic churches. But the proposition does not affirm, that no ancient writers, approved in their day, ever taught the doctrine of infant damnation. It was worded carefully, that I might not be made to say what I did not mean to say, and with perspicuity, that the reviewer might be without excuse should he misrepresent me. It was framed, also, to meet the charge brought against

Calvinists as a body, viz. that infant damnation is inseparable from the Calvinistic system, and that all real, consistent Calvinists believe it, and would preach it, if they dared; and also, to counteract the use so constantly made of it, to prejudice the community against us, and prevent them from hearing evangelical preachers, or uniting with evangelical congregations or churches. To hear a Calvinist was represented as hearing one who believed in the damnation of infants; and this lion was placed, *in terrorem*, in the way, to prevent persons from leaving Unitarian congregations, and coming over to evangelical worship.

To meet the exigency, I denied that infant damnation is included in the Calvinistic system, or had ever been a received doctrine of the churches denominated Calvinistic. Has the reviewer proved, in any way but by reiterated assertion, that it is a vital, essential, inseparable part of the Calvinistic system? Has he advanced an iota of proof to show that infant damnation ever has been, or is now, a received doctrine of the churches denominated Calvinistic?

A received doctrine, the reviewer ought to know, is something different from the opinions of individual authors, however eminent and approved. It is an opinion in which the entire body of Calvinistic churches have been agreed; and in which, in some authentic form, their agreement has been signified. The usual and only proper evidence of a received doctrine, is the Calvinistic creeds—or the unvarying opinion of all writers. The doctrine of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the atonement, the entire depravity of man, regeneration by the special influence of the Holy Spirit, election, justification by faith, the perseverance of the saints, and eternal punishment, are doctrines of Calvinism, in which it is believed all Calvinistic creeds and all Calvinistic writers agree. They therefore, are the received doctrines of the churches denominated Calvinistic. But there are other doctrines, and different modes of stating and explaining these, in which neither creeds nor writers have been agreed. These are not the received doctrines of the entire sect; they are doctrines which, as a whole, they do not receive, but concerning which they differ. To quote, therefore, the opinion of commentators and writers to prove a doctrine a received doctrine of the whole church, which all creeds omit, and on which distinguished commentators and writers differ, is as dishonest as it is weak and illogical. For in what manner have the whole body of Calvinistic churches authorized Calvinistic authors or commentators to speak for them, or signified to the public their universal agreement with them on all points? Or in what possible manner could they signify their agreement, when, on many points, the commentators and writers differ, one from another? What Calvinistic church or minister on earth has adopted, and signified the adoption, of all which Calvin taught? Will Unitarians consent that all which Priestley and Belsham wrote shall be quoted as the

received opinion of the whole Unitarian sect? And yet Priestley is as much the apostle of Unitarians, as Calvin is of Calvinists. Thus, while they cut loose from all responsibility for the avowed opinion of commentators and authors and even living preachers of first eminence of their own, calling no man master, they do not hesitate to charge upon Calvinists, as a body, all the offensive opinions which can be scraped together from all the Calvinistic authors, poets not excepted, which have ever written.

The proof then is ample, that the doctrine of infant damnation is not, and never has been, a received doctrine of the churches denominated Calvinistic. It is not a doctrine of the Calvinistic system. The reviewer has been compelled to admit that it is not contained in the doctrine of original sin, and has only re-asserted, without proof, that it is contained in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. Again we challenge him to prove it. Mere assertions, where argument is demanded, are impotent, and when they come as the only support of slanderous accusation, they do but add insult to injury.

The early Calvinists, as a body, did not, in any form, receive the doctrine of infant damnation. The reviewer himself has furnished conclusive evidence of this fact. The Lutherans, "not content with condemning the Anabaptists, set down the position, that *salvation does not depend on baptism*, among the false and erroneous doctrines of the Calvinists." That baptism is essential to salvation, had, it appears, by a misinterpretation of John iii. 5, come down from the early fathers, those undoubted Unitarians, as the Examiner would have them, and was the principal argument which went to compel the reluctant belief of infant damnation; and Calvin, it seems, was the first to explode the false Unitarian interpretation, which shut the kingdom of heaven against infants, and to give the interpretation adopted by his followers, which opens to them wide the kingdom of glory. I do not believe that the Christian fathers were Unitarians; but if they were, as the Examiner contends, why then Unitarians introduced the doctrine of infant damnation into the church, and Calvinists were the pioneers raised up by providence to expel it.

The Reformati, called technically the Reformed, but now as commonly the Reformers, were 'sometimes Protestants in general, as distinguished from Catholics and heretics, and at others Calvinists as distinguished from Lutherans.' The Reformati were the Calvinists, then; and the testimony of Van Mastricht concerning them is, that "the infants of unbelievers, because the Scriptures determine nothing clearly on the subject, they supposed were to be left to the divine discretion."

But the reviewer, because Van Mastricht says the reformed "think that some infants may be obnoxious to reprobation, as obnoxious to original sin," insists that Van Mastricht asserts that the

Reformed believed that some infants are actually damned ; because obnoxious to reprobation must mean actual reprobation, as obnoxious to original sin, includes its actual existence. The answer is, that in both cases the word means *exposed to* ; for they held that original sin came on infants as a punishment of Adam's transgression. By Adam's sin, infants were *exposed to* original sin, which actually came upon them ; but does it follow from this, that every thing else to which they are exposed by Adam's sin actually comes upon them ? Van Mastricht expressly, and without contradicting himself, states the contrary. He says that while these Reformati, the Calvinists, believed that original sin did come upon all who were exposed to it, concerning the sentence of reprobation, though they could not but admit that infants were exposed to it, as proper subjects, if God pleased, of election and reprobation, yet, that he did elect the children of believers they fully believed, but whether he did elect, or passed by the children of unbelievers, as the Bible taught nothing on the subject, they left them in the hands of God. Van Mastricht does testify as we represented, and he does not testify as the reviewer represents ; neither does he contradict himself ; and if he had, we hope the reviewer will not insist that what a man asserts in one place is not true, because he contradicts it in another.

The articles of the synod of Dort, which it was as relevant to appeal to in evidence of what was the received opinion of the synod, as it was irrelevant in the reviewer to appeal to the private opinions of members to prove it, do not include the doctrine of infant damnation. The reviewer admits, " We do not find the doctrine expressed." No, nor was it in any form received by the synod, as a doctrine of the Bible. According to the reviewer, the synod would not even permit the doctrine to be discussed ; and when the deputies were permitted to lay in their sentiments on the subject, a majority of the deputation did not avow the doctrine, which, to the reviewer, is conclusive evidence that they believed it. It may be so. But did the synod itself receive a doctrine, which they would not allow to be discussed, and which only a minority in an unofficial form avowed ?

The thirty nine articles of the church of England do not contain the doctrine of infant damnation. Again, the reviewer travels out of the record, in quest of parole testimony. He thinks the framers of the articles believed in infant damnation, and that the phrase, " none can enter the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost," meant, according to the common interpretation, " that baptism by water was essential to constitute a living member of Christ's holy church." But has he forgotten that the Lutherans charged the Calvinists with denying that John iii. 5, meant baptism, and made it essential to salvation ? Calvin on the phrase, " born of water and the spirit," says :—

"As if he had said, By the Spirit, who, in the ablution and purification of the souls of the faithful, performs the office of water. Nor is this a novel mode of expression : for it perfectly corresponds with that declaration of John the Baptist : ' He that cometh after me, shall baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*' As to baptise with the Holy Spirit and with fire, therefore, is to confer the Holy Spirit, who, in regeneration, has the office and nature of fire ; so to be born of water and of the Spirit is no other than to receive that influence of the Spirit, which does in the soul what water does on the body. I know that others give a different interpretation, but I have no doubt that this is the genuine sense ; because the intention of Christ is simply to teach that all must be divested of their own nature, who aspire to the kingdom of heaven."

"It is further evident that their notion ought to be exploded, because it adjudges all unbaptised persons to eternal death. Let us suppose their tenet to be admitted, and baptism to be administered to adults alone : what, will they say, will become of a youth who is rightly instructed in the first principles of piety, if he desires to be baptised, but, contrary to the expectation of all around, happens to be snatched away by sudden death ? The Lord's promise is clear ; ' Whosoever believeth on the Son, shall not come into condemnation ;' but ' is passed from death unto life !'† We are nowhere informed of his having condemned one who had not yet been baptised.

"Moreover, they sentence all infants to eternal death, by denying them baptism, which, according to their own confession, is necessary to salvation. Let them see now, how well they agree with the language of Christ, which adjudges the kingdom of heaven to little children." Vol. iii. pp. 374, 375.

Does not the reviewer know the high estimation in which Calvin was held in England, at the time the thirty nine articles were formed ? By what authority then does he insist, contrary to the testimony of the Lutherans and Van Mastricht, that the phrase, born of water and the Spirit, was intended to teach the necessity of baptism to salvation ? If some did understand it so, many did not ; and it is not the received doctrine of the articles.

The Westminster Assembly's confession, adopted by the synod at Cambridge, does not contain the doctrine of infant damnation. The reviewer admits, that the words may have an interpretation put upon them which will make them prove nothing. He is right, and it is the very interpretation which Calvin himself, according to his exposition of John iii. 5, might put upon them ; and which the Reformers, (Calvinists) did put upon them, believing that infants of believers were certainly elected, and as to the children of unbelievers, as the Bible revealed nothing, they believed nothing, but left them to the merciful disposal of God. It is the meaning which Dickinson did, and Calvinists now do, give to the phrase, *elect infants*, and which the words themselves show was the meaning which the assembly put upon them. For, "the others, not elected," are spoken of, not as being infants, but adults, who may be called by the ministry of the word and by the Spirit, and yet never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved. It proves that the assembly believed that some infants are certainly elected and saved, and could not tell but all were. The articles therefore neither teach nor imply infant damnation. So much for European witnesses, to prove that infant damnation has been the

* Matt. iii. 11.

† John iii. 18. v. 24.

received doctrine of the churches denominated Calvinistic. While in respect to New England and the United States, not a creed has been found, not an approved author has been quoted, not an individual has been named,* as teaching the doctrine, amid the thousands of false accusations. In no solitary instance, has the accusation of teaching the doctrine of infant damnation been fastened on creed or approved author. Who the accusers are, who have represented Calvinists as so debased and brutified as to believe infant damnation, and so cowardly as to be afraid to avow it, we now know; and having called upon them for proof of these injurious accusations, and they, having taken time, ransacked libraries, and importuned friends probably on both sides of the Atlantic—have at length discovered and confessed, that they cannot prove what they have asserted, and knew when they made the accusations that they could not prove them. One man only in all America have they found who taught the doctrine, and he a poet, a theological poet, whose ‘Day of Doom,’ once so popular, and “which many aged persons with whom we are acquainted can still repeat, though they may not have met with a copy since they were in leading strings,” is all the palliation the reviewer finds of his enormity, in charging the whole Calvinistic body of New England, and the United States, with believing the doctrine of infant damnation.

And what is the inference from all this, which the reviewer and his friends have drawn? Why, that I am guilty of falsehood—convicted in the teeth—and, like the witnesses, cast down in the streets of the great city, dead, never again to move a pen, or open eye or lip, while shouts of victory long and loud rise up around me, without sympathy enough to check merriment and the sending of gifts. Thus Unitarian reviewers gain, and thus they celebrate their victories.

Here I might stop, but that it is evident that the reviewer supposes I have, in my note and its vindication, made pretensions to an acquaintance with authors which I do not possess, and have denied, ignorantly or wilfully, that they teach what he has abundantly proved that they do teach. I am not surprised that his friends, who read with partial feelings, or even that my own friends, who read without a vivid recollection of the whole controversy, should apprehend that the reviewer has fairly established one point at least against me. But this depends altogether on the question, whether I have denied the point which the reviewer has established; or whether it is, or ever has been, (only as he has chosen to suppose it so,) a point at issue in this controversy.

I have never claimed to be the organ of my party, nor made pretensions to great learning, nor set up for infallibility—attributes with which the reviewer, it seems, delights to clothe me, as the victim is decked with garlands, to render my downfall the more

* Michael Wigglesworth always excepted.

conspicuous, and his victory the more splendid. I volunteered to defend myself and the Calvinistic part of the community from unquestionable, and now proved and admitted slander. If I have made any mistakes, it will give me pleasure to retract them, when they shall be perceived. If the reviewer chooses to ascribe them to unworthy motives, rather than to the liability to mistake incident to all controversial writings, he has my permission.

To understand the subject, it will be needful to refresh the memory both of the reviewer and the reader with the first review of my note, to which my three letters are a reply, and which, in his reply to my three letters, (contained in his volume taken from the *Christian Examiner*,) he has suppressed. In that suppressed review, he interprets my note as saying, that "the doctrine of infant damnation has not been maintained in any respectable Calvinistic book which Dr. B. may reasonably be supposed to have seen or heard of, though he has been, for thirty years, conversant with Calvinistic writers the most approved." He then proceeds to quote his authors, European and American. In my reply, I did not controvert the construction given to my note, because the proofs adduced by the reviewer did not render it necessary. He produced extracts from approved authors, which, as he supposed, contained the doctrine, and with which my note, as he interpreted it, implied a professed acquaintance. I showed that the extracts given from Calvin, Turretin, Edwards, Bellamy, Gale, Boston, &c., do not teach infant damnation. The reviewer has since admitted that all which the extracts say on original sin, and which, if italics and capitals indicate anything, constituted his chief reliance, are nothing to the purpose, and, though urgently challenged, he has declined the attempt to show how predestination proves it, but left these authors to speak for themselves. I have shown that predestination does not include the doctrine of infant damnation. Of course, every passage quoted from Calvin, and Turretin, and Edwards, and Bellamy, and Gale, and Boston, is an utter failure. In respect to Twiss and Gill, I showed that they are not approved authors in the sense of the note. The whole attempt, therefore, in the first review, to convict me of ignorance or misrepresentation failed, of which the omission to republish it, when so necessary to a fair exhibition of the controversy, implies a full consciousness. Still, in his reply to my three letters, the reviewer goes on referring to my note, as if extending its pretensions to accurate knowledge, not only to all the writers he at first quoted, but to all which had since been looked up, perhaps on both sides of the Atlantic. It has now, therefore, become necessary to give the fair interpretation of the note. The language is :

"Having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of

the most distinguished Calvinistic divines, in New England, and in the middle and southern and western States, I must say that I have never seen or heard of any book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man, minister or layman, who believed or taught it. And I feel authorized to say, that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, as any of those who falsely accuse them."

By most approved authors, I ought in fairness to be understood to mean, primarily at least, if not exclusively, the most approved authors of my own school, whose expositions of the doctrines of original sin and predestination reject both the sentiment and the phraseology on which the reviewer at first relied as evidence in the case. The exigences of my argument would also indicate that the most approved writers, in my mind when the note was written, must have been the most approved writers of New England. For it was myself, and the Calvinists of Boston and New England, who came especially in contact with Unitarians, and were slandered by them as holding to infant damnation. To show that Calvinists two hundred years ago did not teach the doctrine might not have been conclusive: For it might have been said, 'You reject some things which the Reformers believed, and, for aught we can tell, you may believe what they rejected.' It was, therefore, immediately and logically and almost exclusively relevant to appeal, in refutation of an existing calumny, to our own most approved authors.

If, then, the *language* of my note would possibly bear a more extended construction, environed as it is by these circumstances, it does not admit of it; for an author is not to be understood to mean all which it is possible to attach to his language, but what, from the circumstances of the case, he ought reasonably to be supposed to mean. But if you take the language of the note itself, and press out its entire possible meaning, it begins and ends with American writers. "Having been conversant with the most approved Calvinistic writers and most distinguished divines—*of New England, and in the middle and southern and western States—*" Now if I should be refused the privilege of being understood as referring to the most approved writers of New England, and the meaning should be extended in respect to writers, as it is in respect to men, to the middle and southern and western States, still, by grammatical construction, as well as the force of circumstances, the writers referred to are exclusively those of the United States. Yet the reviewer quotes a long list of European writers, in evidence of my ignorance and falsehood, as if I had made the express declaration that I had read *all* the Calvinistic writers of the whole world, who are, or ever were at any time most approved; and that, to my certain knowledge, no approved Calvinistic writer does, or ever did, teach that infants are damned. He is obliged to set up, as the language of my note, what it does not say or mean, before, by any possibility, he can bring me

within the range of his guns. And having, by his discharge, torn to pieces and utterly discomfited the image of his own creation, he celebrates his victory, and calls hard names.

But suppose the note did extend to European writers, what does it say? Does it say that I have carefully read them all, and am certain that none of them teach infant damnation? May not one who, for thirty years, has been in the habit of referring to and consulting authors on the various topics of theology, speak of himself as having been *conversant* with those writers, without the pretension of having read them all verbatim? If, in the progress of such an acquaintance, he has not met with the doctrine of infant damnation, does not this amount to a strong presumption that the writers do not contain it? Does my language or my argument imply anything more?

Again; does the note say that these most approved writers referred to do not teach the doctrine of infant damnation? No such thing. It merely says, what I meant to say, that *I have not seen* the doctrine in any approved writer. Has the reviewer proved that I had seen it in some approved writers? That I have never heard a book referred to as containing it. Has any evidence been adduced that I had heard a book referred to as containing it? Such, if I mistake not, is the fair interpretation of my note.

But it will be claimed, that in my vindication of the note, I have taken "a wider range," and assumed positions greatly in advance of the note itself. Very well, and if they are untenable I shall not fail to make honorable retractions—an example, if it should be needed, which I hope may be followed by other gentlemen, on whose part it may be quite as necessary and becoming. But still, confession cannot be reasonably demanded until after conviction. Let us then examine the subject. It will be said, If Calvin did not teach the doctrine of infant damnation in the passages at first quoted, still, in your cross questioning, you make him say, that he never taught it,—that the strongest passages in his writings, however tortured, cannot be made to teach any such opinion. True; but has the reviewer forgotten, that in giving his quotations from Calvin, he expressed his belief that there are *no stronger passages to be produced* than those which he had produced;—that I claimed, and, as I think, proved, that these do not contain the doctrine in question;—and that Calvin's reply is not to be understood as an assertion of mine that he nowhere taught infant damnation, but the reviewer's own concession that he had produced the strongest passages put into Calvin's mouth, and, that he might not misunderstand it, put in quotation, as an *argumentum ad hominem*—not on my own responsibility, for I had not read all that Calvin had ever written, and should not have dared to make such an assertion, but upon the authority of the reviewer, that he knew all about

Calvin, and had given the strongest passages—on *his* authority, I represented Calvin as saying that he had nowhere taught the doctrine of infant damnation. The reviewer, it seems, has discovered that he was mistaken. (I hope his friends will not think him an ignoramus or a liar.) He has found out that he had not produced the strongest passages, and has charged me with ignorance and falsehood for assuming, as true, his own mistakes. I acknowledge that I deserve as much buffeting as I have received, for taking it for granted that the reviewer knew what he professed to know about Calvin, and am disposed, with all charity, to regard his error as a mistake. If, however, a falsehood it must be, it can no longer be a matter of uncertainty who is the father of it.

But I have said, "As CALVINISM has so long been misrepresented in this point, (infant damnation,) I choose to take a wider range, and show that in every age the most authentic documents stamp falsehood upon the charge that Calvinists believe and teach the damnation of infants." The false accusations which I set out to disprove, as the passage implies, and the execution of my purpose shows, were, 1. The charge that Calvinism includes the doctrine of infant damnation; and, 2. That "Calvinists as a body"—"the churches denominated Calvinistic" hold it. The documents, by which I proposed to stamp falsehood on these accusations, were, not writers whose individual opinion I formerly rejected as competent evidence of the faith of a denomination; but confessions of faith—creeds. And upon the two accusations above named, these most authentic documents have stamped falsehood, and with a die which can never be obliterated.

In respect to the imposing array of ancient authors who do teach the doctrine of infant damnation, and the reiterated charges of ignorance or falsehood, the reviewer ought to understand, that his shafts, even were they dipped in gall, must pass through another body and leave their venom behind, before they can reach mine. The brief history of the case is as follows: The reviewer and others charged upon the Calvinistic system and upon "all real consistent Calvinists of the present age," the doctrine of infant damnation. I deny the charge as a slander. He attempts to prove it by extracts from Calvin, and Turretin, and Boston, and Gale, and Twiss, and Gill, and Edwards, and Bellamy. I show that not one of these writers teach the doctrine in the extracts given, with the exception of Twiss and Gill, and that these, in the fair sense of the note, are not most approved authors. Foiled in his first attempt, he tries again, and after a long and laborious research, finds some ancient Calvinists who do teach infant damnation, and exults in his escape, and upbraids me with ignorance or duplicity. But upon whom does the charge of ignorance fall first and heaviest? Upon him who ascribes an odious opinion to writers, of the truth of which, at the time, he has no evidence, and escapes the

conviction of bearing false witness by looking up his testimony afterwards? Or him, who presumed them to be innocent until they should be proved guilty? But thus the case stands, on this point, between the reviewer and myself.

That the Calvinistic system did not contain the doctrine of infant damnation I knew ;—that living Calvinists, as a body, did not believe or teach it I knew ;—that no American theological writer of any eminence taught it, I fully believed ;—and that no ancient respectable Calvinistic writers taught it, was my entire persuasion. And most evidently, at the time the reviewer made his attack on my note, he was as ignorant as myself of the testimony which he has since looked up. The difference between us then is, that he, without evidence, made accusations against ancient Calvinistic writers, which I without evidence refused to believe, and presumed to be unfounded.

I have understood that the reviewer, having consulted judicious friends, says, that they have advised him to pay no sort of attention to this reply. To my apprehension, his friends, whom he styles judicious, have in their advice given evidence that they deserve the appellation ; and in following their advice, he will, I think, give higher evidence of wisdom than he has given, in charging the doctrine of infant damnation upon the Calvinistic system, and upon all real and consistent Calvinists of past and present times. And, perhaps, if he had listened to a judicious friend in the beginning, who may have warned him to let contention alone before it was meddled with, he might have been still wiser.

I have now accomplished, if I do not mistake, the *end* for which at first I volunteered in the note, and its defence,—the vindication of the Calvinistic system, the churches denominated Calvinistic, and the Calvinists of New England and the United States, from the charge of holding the doctrine of infant damnation. Towards the reviewer, as a gentleman, I have no feelings but those of kindness ; and if I have, at times, employed the language of severity, it has not been, if I know my own heart, the dictate of exasperated feeling, but the performance of an act of *justice*, which, though painful in itself, was imperiously demanded, both by truth and by public utility.

LYMAN BEECHER.

REVIEWS.

MEMOIRS of the Life, Writings, and Character, Literary, Professional, and Religious, of the late JOHN MASON GOOD, M. D.
By OLINTHUS GREGORY, LL. D. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1829.

The history of a great mind is always interesting. But when high intellectual and *moral* attainments are associated in the same character, and sustained through a life of eminent usefulness, the interest which we feel is of the deepest and purest kind. There is nothing, there can be nothing, pertaining to mankind, more worthy of our interest, than a character at once truly great and truly good. Such was the subject of this Memoir. His "intellectual and moral portrait" is also delineated by a skilful artist, although he modestly informs us, that "the papers which have been preserved with unusual care, in a tolerably connected series, will furnish the principal materials for the picture, and, thus free him in a great measure from the temptation, either to overcharge the likeness, or to intercept its exhibition by placing himself before it."

The following condensed passage will present to the reader, in a single view, both the compiler and the subject of this Memoir.

"If it be true, as has been often affirmed, that there has rarely passed a life of which a faithful and judicious narrative would not be interesting and instructive; it will surely not be unreasonable to hope that advantage may result from even an imperfect development of the circumstances that contributed to the formation of a character of no ordinary occurrence; one which combined successfully the apparently incongruous attributes of contemplation and of activity; where memory evinced with equal energy its faculties of acquisition, of retention, and of promptness in reproduction; and where, in consequence, the individual attained an extraordinary eminence, not merely in one department of literature or science, but in several; and proved himself equally expert in the details of practice, and in the researches of theory; allowing neither the fatigues of the one nor the absorptions of the other, permanently to extinguish that thirst after the chief good which is the noblest characteristic of true greatness of mind." p. 14.

A most important inquiry to parents and teachers, in perusing the history of an illustrious character, or of a distinguished mind, is, What causes were concerned in its production? It is believed that circumstances, in a measure under our control, impart to children at an early age the seeds and elements of their subsequent character.

The following passage is so much to the point, and of so much practical importance that we need not apologize for inserting it entire.

"They who remark in how many instances apparently slight circumstances give the essential determination to character; who recollect, for example, the fact that both the father and the husband of *Michael Angelo's* nurse were stonemasons, and that the chisel which she often put into his infant hands as a plaything, served to create the bent of genius which issued in the sculptures of that admirable artist—or who are aware how much the poetic inspiration of the ex-

cellent Montgomery was nurtured by the early perusal of Cowper's Poems, the only work of taste and imagination which he was allowed to read while at Fulneck school—will not fail to notice what various particulars concurred in the arrangements for John Mason at this susceptible age, to implant in his mind those principles of thought, and feeling, and action, which, ultimately exfoliated, produced that character in maturity which it is our object to portray. From Mr. Mason's "Rules for Students," and from the example of his father, he learned that these "five things are necessary; a proper distribution and management of his time; a right method of reading to advantage; the order and regulation of his studies; the proper way of collecting and preserving useful sentiments from books and conversation; and the improvement of his thoughts when alone;" from Mr. Mason's Essays on "the Principles of Harmony," the illustrations in which are selected with much taste and judgment, he early acquired a relish for easy and mellifluous versification; from the example of his parents, and from that of Mr. Mason, which they taught him to contemplate with veneration, he imbibed the persuasion that universal knowledge did not obstruct the road to eminence in any one pursuit; and a conviction equally strong, though not so invariably in operation, that true piety was susceptible of a happy union with talent and genius: and, superadded to all this, the localities of Romsey enkindled in his bosom a love for rural scenery and rural pleasures, which he never lost." p. 18, 19.

The principal causes of difference in minds and character are the following. First, constitutional endowments. Secondly, the influence of early associations and instruction, or what may be called the education of circumstances,—in respect to which the subject of this Memoir was highly favored. His father, an evangelical minister, and a man of sound wisdom and piety, devoted himself, while his children were young, to the instruction and superintendence of "a few pupils, fixing the *maximum* at sixteen in number, including his own sons."

"A desire to preserve his children from the more obvious evils of public schools, and to supply them with the advantage of select associates placed him in a sphere of employment, but not of weary or anxious labor, with a happy competency, and in the immediate vicinity of the sweetly variegated scenery of the huge forest. Fond of rural enjoyments, fond of domestic life, fond of acquiring and communicating knowledge, fond of select and intelligent society, fond of benevolent exertion, blessed with the confluence of these streams of delight." p. 17.

Such was the combination of felicitous circumstances, which conspired in forming the character of Dr. Good. The intelligent reader of his Memoir will perceive their features strongly impressed upon his whole life.—Thirdly, the active agency of the individual himself, on which more depends than on either or both of the preceding causes. This is the respect in which every man *makes himself*. Nature and circumstances did much for Dr. Good, but he himself did more. He encouraged and sustained through life the four cardinal qualities of a successful student, ardor, docility, diligence, order. He was *ardent*. His zeal for knowledge was a perpetual and increasing fire. It was a real desire for knowledge, rather than for its fame. Doubtless he was, to some extent, ambitious, but he seems to have been more desirous to possess the reality than the appearance of learning. Perhaps no student could ever say with more truth, "*Labor ipse voluptas.*"

His *docility* was remarkable, especially as it existed in connexion with so much genius and ardor. Bold and ardent genius is usually ungovernable. It will not learn from others, however much it may learn of itself. This is an unfortunate fact. Most bold and mighty geniuses are ruined by self-will. When the will is pliant, and the mind docile, in connexion with a strong and regular genius, there is then, a rare combination of qualities, and a most happy result may be anticipated. The following is a specimen of the docility of Dr. Good.

"Such was the delight with which he pursued his studies of every kind, that it occasioned an entire absorption of thought; so that when he was little more than twelve years of age, his habit of hanging over his books had produced a curvature in his back, equally unfavorable to his growth and his health. His father, anxious to remove this evil, earnestly besought him to join with his fellow students in their various games and sports; and ere long he engaged in these also with his characteristic ardor, and became as healthful, agile, and erect as any of his youthful associates."

This should serve as a valuable hint to all pupils. It is one of many instances, in which the docility of young Good preserved his life, and secured his final greatness. He never presumed that there were no others wiser than he. This docility of temper was maintained through life, and proved of immense advantage to him, not only by enlarging his compass of professional and liberal knowledge, but by recovering him from erroneous and dangerous principles respecting the most momentous of all subjects, and conducting him to a saving knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. He was in the true and proper sense, *liberal*—always willing to learn. Obstinacy was no part of his intellectual or moral habit.

His *diligence* was almost unparalleled. Never did a man act more fully up to the spirit of his motto, "The measure of life is not the number of its days and years, but the amount of its virtues and duties performed." The following is a specimen of his diligence.

"He was finishing his translation of Solomon's 'Song of Songs,' carrying on his life of Dr. Geddes, and walking from twelve to fourteen miles a day, to see his numerous patients: nor was this all. In a letter to Dr. Drake, after speaking of these engagements, and adverting with thankfulness to the state of his business as a surgeon (which then produced more than 1400*l.* per annum,) he proceeds thus: 'I have edited the Critical Review, besides writing several of its most elaborate articles. I have every week supplied a column of matter for the *Sunday Review*—and have for some days had the great weight of the British Press upon my hands.'

"So great a variety of occupations would have thrown most men into confusion; but such was the energy of Mr. Good's mind, such his habits of activity and order, that he carried them all forward simultaneously, suffering none to be neglected, left in arrear, or inadequately executed."

His love of *order* is said to have been his "ruling passion," and his habits of order were perfectly formed, and universally applied.

"These habits of order, the foundation of which constituted a part of his education, and the consolidation of which was so greatly aided by the circumstances

of his apprenticeship, were evinced through life. The arrangements of his wardrobe, his books, his accounts, his papers, his manuscripts, his time, all bore the stamp of this peculiarity."

As the Memoir of Dr. Good will undoubtedly be read by the more intelligent members of the community, we shall not anticipate their judgment respecting the amount and value of his intellectual habits and attainments. To us they are astonishing. That a man, in the period of a life not unusually long, should have become a master in so many entirely distinct departments of knowledge ;—that he should have ranged through the whole field of oriental, and classical, and modern literature, and made himself familiar, not only with the Hebrew, Syriack, Persian, Greek, Latin, German, Italian, French, Spanish, and English *languages*, but also with the *contents* of most of the principal works in each ;—that he should also have become a thorough scholar in various departments of natural and moral science, as his 'Book of Nature' and other similar productions evince him to have been ;—that he should also have gained the highest rank in the profession of medicine and surgery, both in theory and practice, and have contributed one of the most valuable works ('The Study of Medicine,') to that profession, which it has ever received ;—that he should also have enlarged his mind with copious practical knowledge, on almost all subjects of interest or utility ;—that he should be engaged in making translations of the Book of Job, and the Psalms, and Solomon's Song, from the Hebrew—in executing his 'great work,' his translation of Lucretius, from the Latin—in publishing notes and practical commentaries on the Scriptures—in writing poetry—in delivering lectures on physical and moral science and general knowledge—in preparing memoirs—in furnishing matter for two or three distinguished periodicals—and all with such success, as completely to confront the adage, that 'the man of all pursuits is good at none,'—and besides all this, walking twelve or fourteen miles a day, to attend upon so many patients as to yield him fourteen hundred pounds a year,—this truly is more than surprising, it is astonishing to *us*, who have yet so much to learn respecting the true value and improvement of time. We are almost ready to lay down our books, in despair of ever knowing or doing any thing.

We shall now briefly notice the *religious* character of Dr. Good. The compiler remarks,

"The distinction between the faculties of man as an accountable being, and his attributes as an intellectual being, is as palpable, and as difficult to be evaded by inquirers who deal fairly with themselves and with their species, as the distinction between mind and matter, or the active energy of thought, and the inertia of a stone."

That man 'is constituted to be a religious being,' no less than an intellectual being—that he is capable of sustaining an accountable, not less than an intellectual relation, to God and his creatures—is what every one knows, or may know. It is in vain for us to

attempt to be atheists, or to throw off our moral responsibility ; for there is a principle in every man's nature, which makes him know that he is responsible for his conduct. That principle was implanted by God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, who formed man to be a subject of his moral kingdom.

Man is constitutionally a physical, an intellectual, and a moral being. In a barbarous state of society, his *physical* nature is considered the most important. A man is estimated by the size and strength of his body. In a state of partial cultivation, one degree above barbarism, his *intellectual* nature is most regarded. Pedantry and pride of learning prevail, and a man is estimated principally by the supposed strength of his intellect. The question is not, is he morally *good*, but is he intellectually *great*. In a state of highest cultivation, when man is found in his most perfect and happy condition, his *moral* nature is first regarded. The first inquiry respecting him is, does he sustain his accountable relations to God and all his fellow beings? His moral principle, more than his intellectual attainments or his physical power, constitutes the standard of excellence. In this view, how much of barbarism still remains, even in this day of self-styled intelligence and refinement! Society will not have reached its highest, purest, happiest state of cultivation, till the love of God, ruling the heart and swaying the character, is regarded as the chief excellence of man. Knowledge then ceases to produce pedantry and conceit. Pure and humble piety, combining with sound and modest intelligence, constitutes a basis of character, beloved on earth and approved in heaven. Relevant to this point, the following passage is full of truth and wisdom.

"In this age of intellectual and religious illumination, the scales of moral judgement are, too often, equally defective. I need not attempt to sketch the characters of the successful commercial man, the able barrister, the skilful physician, the man of deep and fortunate research, and many others in every profession and every rank, who have passed through the world without raising a serious thought towards their Creator and Preserver, or prescribing to themselves any code of morals except that which accorded most with the modes and fashions of their respective classes, and kept God and his will most out of sight. Yet, who dare censure? nay, who must not commend? For whom have they injured? What law have they broken? If the case is to be decided by the law of courtesy, or of worldly reputation, who but must praise? If by the laws of their country, they must stand unimpeached. Still, a thoughtful man may venture, notwithstanding, to hint that there is a law, less fleeting, awfully binding, nobly universal,—the law of Him who is 'a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart,' who demands a surrender of all our faculties and affections to his service, in 'whose sight even the heavens are not clean,' and before whom something is required which a conformity to the laws of honor, courtesy and reputation cannot alone supply."

It has surprised some, that men of distinguished success in their respective professions and callings, should have often failed to discover the sublime features of religious truth, and the real glory of the Gospel. But our Saviour has informed us that not many wise and noble are called ; and for this undeniable fact the following remark suggests a reason.

"The principal reason in all and each is the same. The mind, while left to itself, is so absorbed in its selected pursuit, whether it be of literature, science, or business, as to have neither time nor inclination to turn to so serious a concern as that of religion."

It is practically assumed by many, that a man's judgement in religious subjects is valuable, in proportion to his eminence in his own particular calling. Hence the spirit of the inquiry in all ages, 'Have any of the rulers and pharisees believed on him?' But the truth is, that men most eminent in their particular calling, usually know but little *out* of it. They are "*totus in illis*," absorbed in their profession. Their minds are engrossed with secular pursuits, and they have little time or inclination to think of religion. An intelligent farmer, of sound common sense, who devotes his evenings to reading on religious subjects, has frequently a degree of knowledge and judgement in theology far superior to theirs.

Dr. Good, however, was an exception to the general fact. Distinguished as he was in his profession, his mind did not consent to expatiate alone in that; for he was scarcely less distinguished as a philosopher, and as a classical and biblical scholar. He was at first a materialist and a Unitarian; and such he might have continued, had he been entirely absorbed in his profession, and been satisfied, as many are, to take his religious views, upon trust, from the pulpit. He examined, reflected, and judged for himself; and he cherished a sincere respect for truth. Such a man is an intelligent and honest *seeker*, and he will ultimately *find*. Dr. Gregory remarks, in reference to the erroneous views of Dr. Good at this time,

"Yet, happily, Mr. Good was to a great extent preserved from the worst tendencies of this system. He was too learned and too honest ever to affirm that the belief of the divinity and atonement of our Lord was unknown in the purest age of the church, but was engendered among other corruptions by false philosophy; and he had uniformly too great a regard for the scriptures of the New Testament, to assert that the apostles indulged in far-fetched reasoning, or made use of a Greek word, (*μενεγανης*), which conveyed an erroneous notion, from want of knowledge of the term they ought to have employed: he never contended that St. Paul did not mean to teach the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians; never sported the pernicious sophism, that 'where mystery begins religion ends.' Being 'buried alive' in occupations, and immersed in vexations of no ordinary occurrence, he did not commune frequently with his own heart, and too naturally sunk into a lamentable indifference to religion, at least, if that word correctly imply 'converse with God;' but he never evinced indifference to truth and rectitude, nor ever, I believe, became involved in the more awful perplexities of skepticism."

As Dr. Good continued to search the Scriptures, and to extend his keen and practical observation of mankind, he became more and more convinced of the scriptural view of the character, condition, and moral relations and destinies of man; of the proper divinity and atonement of Christ, and of the way of salvation through him. His dissatisfaction, of course, increased

with the erroneous views which he had adopted, until his mind and heart broke from their servitude, and ascended to God in sentiments of evangelical faith and love. He became a sound and consistent believer in Christ. The reader of this Memoir will be interested in the correspondence, which then ensued between him and the skeptical preacher, on whose ministry he had attended for many years. It resulted in his detaching himself from the preacher and the Unitarian sect, and attending at the Temple church, where the powerful reasoning of Dr. Rennell, often engaged in the discussion of topics which, at this period, occupied so much of Dr. Good's attention, seemed to confirm him in the propriety of the step he had taken. "Subsequently, at St. John's Chapel, he availed himself of the successive pastoral labors of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Jerram, until he passed from all worshipping assemblies here, to join *the general assembly and church of the first-born in heaven.*"

Dr. Gregory remarks,

"It was in one of our confidential conversations on the most momentous of all topics, in the summer of 1815, that Mr. Good first distinctly announced to me his cordial persuasion that the evangelical representation of the doctrines of Scripture was that which *alone* accorded with the system of revealed truth. He said he had greatly hesitated as to the correctness of a proposition I had advanced a few years before,* that there was no intermediate ground upon which a sound reasoner could make a fair stand, between that of pure deism and that of moderate orthodoxy, as held by the evangelical classes both of churchmen and dissenters; but that he now regarded that proposition as correct. At the same time he detailed several of the Socinian and Arian interpretations of passages usually brought forward in these disputes, and, with his accustomed frankness, explained how he had come, by degrees, to consider them all as unsatisfactory, and, for an accountable being, *unsafe.*"

"Rock of ages! here I build;

Here, if so thy grace has willed,

Quit the world, and seek in thee,

All I want or wish to be."

That the religious views of Dr. Good had now become thoroughly sound and scriptural, will appear from the following passages from his pen, and numerous others of similar import.

"The triumphant language of the apostle has been fulfilled; his prophetic vision has been realized; and Christ has proved most marvellously the power and the wisdom of God in every age of the world since his own era. Yet how incorrigible is the heart of man when perverted! how obstinate in its errors! how blind to the noon-day, 'the light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun,' that shines around it!—If the question be still asked, 'Where is the disputer of this world?' Thousands will, even to the present hour, hold up their hands unabashed, and proudly accept the Scripture challenge. They go to Bethlehem, indeed, but they return as they go there: no heavenly music has sounded in their ears; they have seen neither angel nor Saviour; they went not to worship, and will not believe. 'The thing which has come to pass,' and which the Lord hath made known to mankind at large, they regard, not as matter of implicit faith and holy wonder, but as matter for the tribunal of their own reason. With insufferable arrogance, they arraign the Godhead before its impotent bar; they measure the plan of infinite wisdom, the energy of Almighty power, the great mystery of godliness, by their own standard;

* In my "Letters on the Evidences, Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Religion."

and convict the cause of falsehood or of error upon the sole ground that reason cannot comprehend it. And hence, as in the time of the apostles, to some it is, in many parts, a stumbling block, to others altogether foolishness; some, sitting in the seat of the scorner, would summarily enter a general verdict of imposture: while more, perhaps, not far off, though openly condemning one half, are yet ready enough, with an affectation of liberality, to acquit the remainder, on being allowed to put their own corrections into the inspired text.—Merciful God! great, indeed, was thy long-suffering that waited in the days of Noah! but how much greater is that which waiteth in our own day, overpowered as it is in such a diversity of ways, with ‘the profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called.’”

“What can more forcibly demonstrate to us the intrinsic enormity of sin, of sin of every kind, the utter abhorrence with which God beholds it, in all its incalculable ramifications, its essential repugnancy to the purity and holiness of his own nature, than the stupendous cost of its atonement. Though armed with almighty power, God has not the power to forgive sin unconditionally.”

“The flashes of immortality, whenever God pleases, are all searching and penetrating, and what is otherwise most powerful sinks into nothing, compared with the irresistible energy with which the Holy Spirit prepares his own way into the heart of man, and transforms that heart into a living temple for himself.”

The position asserted by Dr. Gregory, and accorded by Dr. Good, that there is no intermediate point which a sound and consistent reasoner can assume and hold, between evangelical principles and deism, is become palpably true. An active and intelligent mind, finding its ground untenable, will keep moving from one point to another, either upward towards an evangelical faith, or downward towards avowed infidelity.

In religion, as in science, individual principles resolve themselves into general ones, as knowledge advances. The radical difference between an evangelical and a deistical faith is, that the one makes the Bible the sun in our moral world, and creation reflects its light; while the other makes creation the sun, and the Bible reflects its light. The one implies a firm belief of the fact of a *revealed* religion, and the inspiration of its records; the other is a verging towards deism, or rather it *is* deism in principle, though the principle may not be fully applied. The one assumes the necessity of *revealed* light; the other virtually assumes the sufficiency of nature’s light, admitting, indeed, professedly, the Gospel, but the “Gospel heathenized.”

Dr. Good lived about twenty years after the change took place in his religious views, and after he began to exhibit evidence of a saving conversion to Christ. He appears to have possessed great completeness of Christian character. Notwithstanding his wonderful success in anything in which he engaged, the reader of his Memoirs will learn that he was called to pass through trials repeated and severe, insomuch that few could say, with more experience of its truth,

“Life is a series of griefs and harrassments; and we no sooner escape from one evil, than we have to encounter another.”

But he could say in truth,

"For all this there is but one remedy; and, blessed be God, that remedy is a specific; it has stood the test of nearly two thousand years, and has never failed in a single instance. It is the repose of the Christian upon his Saviour; a consciousness of his perpetual presence and support."

As he approached the period of his dissolution, he was more than ever convinced of his sinfulness, and entire dependance on the Saviour. He observes,

"No man living can be more sensible than I am, that there is nothing in ourselves; and of the absolute necessity of relying only upon the merits of Jesus Christ."—"It was most strikingly impressive to hear his quivering lips uttering the words of Scripture, at a time when intense agony occasioned such convulsive motions of the whole body that the bed often shook under him."—"One of the texts he appeared to dwell upon with most earnestness and delight, was, 'JESUS CHRIST, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.'"

His faculties began to fail him, so that he was nearly insensible to worldly objects. "His hearing now became greatly affected. Mr. Russell called to him in a loud voice, 'Jesus Christ the Saviour:' he was not insensible to *that* sound. His valuable clerical friend then repeated to him, in the same elevated tone, '*Behold the Lamb of God.*' This roused him, and with energy, the energy of a dying believer, he terminated the sentence, 'WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD,'—which were the last words he intelligibly uttered, being about three hours before his death."

Dr. Good's writings, professional, philosophical and literary, are copious, and extensively known. His "History of Medicine," his "Study of Medicine," his "Book of Nature," his "Translation of Lucretius," his "Memoirs of Dr. Geddes," his translations of Job and the "Song of Solomon," are his principal works before the public. He also directed considerable attention to the prophecies of Ezekiel, Joel and Zechariah, the book of Ecclesiastes, &c., of striking passages in each of which he has left translations. He translated the book of Psalms, realizing great pleasure in going through so rich a treasure of spiritual and unrivalled poetry.

"Had he published nothing but his 'Translation of Lucretius,' he would have acquired a high character for free, varied and elegant classification, for exalted acquisitions as a philosopher and a linguist, and for singular felicity in the choice and exhibition of materials in a rich store of critical and tasteful illustration.

"Had he published nothing but his 'Translation of the book of Job,' he would have obtained an eminent station amongst Hebrew scholars and the promoters of Biblical learning.

"And had he published nothing but his 'Study of Medicine,' his name would, in the opinion of one of his ablest professional correspondents, have gone down to posterity, associated with the science of medicine itself, as one of its most skilful practitioners, and one of its most learned promoters."

"I know not how to name another individual who has arrived at equal eminence in three such totally distinct departments of mental application."

But, exalted as his intellectual attainments were, modesty and discretion preserved him from conceit and the pride of learning,

and conducted him, by the grace of God, to a correct apprehension and an adoring love of the sublime truths and principles of the Gospel of Christ. Tongues shall cease, and knowledge shall vanish away, but charity (true religion) never faileth.

Commendation and Reproof of Unitarians ; a Sermon delivered in the Second Universalist Church in Boston, Sabbath Evening, Nov. 26, 1829. By HOSEA BALLOU, Pastor. Boston : Henry Bowen. pp. 19.

The author of this discourse has some claims to be considered as the inventor and father of the present prevailing system of Universalism in this country.* Accordingly, his style of address is that of one who felt himself entitled to speak with a degree of authority—to speak not only for himself, but for his brethren, his children. The first part of the discourse before us is taken up with his ‘commendation of Unitarians ;’ the latter with ‘reproof.’

“Our Unitarian brethren,” says he, “have just claims to our respect and approbation for many things, which both duty and inclination induce us to acknowledge. They hold many, and indeed the most important points of the Christian faith, accordingly as we believe they are revealed in the sacred scriptures.”

“They have renounced the unreasonable, perplexing doctrine of the trinity, and have driven its most able defenders to make concessions which amount to its entire renunciation. They have laid aside, as an uncomfortable, worn out garment, the whole scheme of vicarious sufferings, and of placating the wrath of an offended God ; and have made the happy discovery of a compassionate, kind and merciful Father in the supreme ruler of the universe. The doctrine of partial election and eternal reprobation they have dismissed with its deserved disapprobation. They have rejected the old notion of man’s entire depravity, and told that he is capable of moral improvement, in knowledge and holiness ; and in place of the visionary notions about a radical change of our nature, they insist on the more reasonable doctrine of a Christian and virtuous education. And they moreover acknowledge all the divine perfections of our heavenly Father, believing in his infinite wisdom, power and goodness, and in the entire impartiality of his love to his creatures.”

If this representation is correct, Unitarians and Universalists are in fact *agreed*, in all the leading points of their theology. They are as well agreed as the members of either sect are among themselves ; and we see no reason why they should henceforth exist, or be regarded, as separate denominations. Mr. Ballou is a Unitarian—a leading Unitarian—a patriarchal Unitarian, who has labored longer and more successfully to promote Unitarianism than almost any

* A very different theory from those of Rely, Murray and Winchester, all of whom were professed Trinitarians. The historian of Modern Universalism, speaking of the change of views which has taken place since the time of Murray, says, ‘The labors of Rev. Hosea Ballou may be regarded as one of the *principal means of this change*.’ p. 432.

person living. In all the former part of this discourse, he writes like other Unitarians; quotes the same irrelevant proof-texts in support of his positions; makes the same distorted and unfounded representations of the sentiments of the Orthodox; and adopts, throughout, the interpretations, the cant, the peculiar phraseology, of those whom he commends. Speaking of the sentiments of Unitarians, he says,

"We find no fault with these sentiments. *We believe them all, and endeavored to persuade others of their truth and importance, long before the controversy between the Orthodox and Unitarians produced a division in this country.* The hearer will ask, if the statements which have been made, concerning doctrine, do not, in the most plain and perfect manner, amount to real Universalism? We reply, that in our opinion *they do.*"

For what then, it will be inquired, does Mr. B. *reprove* his Unitarian brethren? After so much commendation, and such a cordial ageement in doctrine, what does he discover in them deserving of censure? He shall answer for himself.

"1. As the Unitarian doctors, some of them at least, are not a whit behind the first in the world, as to natural talents, or acquired abilities, there seems to be no ground for supposing that *they do not know*, that the tenets of their faith, which they openly avow, both in their preaching and writings, do in fact necessarily lead to the belief of Universal Salvation; yet they, as a denomination, will not own that they believe it. So far from being ingenuous enough to profess openly the blessed doctrine of Universal Salvation, they generally so arrange and manage their public discourses as not only to keep this doctrine out of sight, but to cause the unlearned hearers to believe that their preachers disbelieve it."

A palpable trick, a gross imposition this, if it is indeed so. And Mr. B. declares, 'with feelings of reluctance,' that he has an indubitable conviction of its being a fact, as he has 'been pained to witness the truth of' it, 'with his own ears, times not a few.'

"2. Notwithstanding the purity of the great, leading principles maintained by Unitarian preachers, they rather avoid them in their common preaching, seldom bring them as the necessary food for their congregations, rather choosing to employ themselves in speculations of their own curious inventions, about a future state of rewards and punishments.* Thus with their speculations, unsupported by one word of divine authority, they invade the world to come, and amuse themselves and their hearers with the curious textures of a web, both the warp and woof of which is of their own invention."

"3. Such are the exalted notions which these brethren entertain of the moral improvements which they are making, that it is not unfrequent that they preach sermons on the fruitful subject, in which they endeavor to convey to their hearers an understanding of the immense distance which they are likely to be advanced in the future world, before their fellow beings, who, in consequence of their sinful neglects, in this world, will have to suffer, more or less, in the world to come; while they for their vigilance here are to enjoy indescribable felicity."

"4. Among those commendable things which were named, in approbation of our Unitarian brethren, the hearer will recollect their liberality towards those Christians who differ from them in opinions. They have been laboring with all *their* Christian meekness, for years, to persuade their Orthodox brethren to extend to them the right hand of Christian fellowship, and to consent to reciprocate ministerial exchanges. Now if the profession of liberality, without the practice, could make these brethren rich, in the righteousness of God, the angels of heaven might envy their attainments! Will they exchange desks with Universalists?

* Not eternal punishments, as will subsequently appear.

By no means. What is the reason? Because in some points of doctrine we do not come exactly to their views. As to doctrine generally, *they* will allow that we are much nearer them than are their Orthodox brethren, whom they are constantly inviting to exchange! Now if they, like the Orthodox, were *conscientious* in refusing to exchange desks with those who hold doctrines opposed to their own, they would act according to their profession, and would be consistent with themselves. But how are they to be justified in making those pretensions to liberality, while in fact it is not real? Is this Christianity? Is it genuine *honesty*? Is it such practice as this that is to give them such exalted stations, as they anticipate, in the coming world? We beseech them either to discontinue the profession of liberality, or by their practice to convince us that they are sincere in it."

With these complaints of Universalists against their 'Unitarian brethren,' however much we may be amused, we cannot be supposed to be very deeply interested. We do think it hard, however,—as Universalists discovered and embraced all the leading points of Unitarian theology, 'and endeavored to persuade others of their truth and importance, *long before** the present Unitarians had courage to avow them, or were 'sufficiently enlightened (bedarkened) to perceive their truth,'—we think it hard, under such circumstances, that Unitarians should refuse to acknowledge their spiritual progenitors, and withhold from them the hand of fellowship. We should be at a loss to reconcile such conduct with the boasted liberality of Unitarians, or with the principles on which they profess to act. And we should like to see some of their 'doctors' grapple with the appeals of Mr. B., and undertake to reply to his statement of grievances, on the subject of their exclusiveness.

We have seen that, in the judgement of Mr. B., all consistent Unitarians are Universalists. And he has an 'indubitable conviction' that Unitarians in this region do perceive and admit the necessary result of their principles, though they have not the courage and honesty to avow it. Now this is just what the Orthodox have long supposed and often said—said perhaps too often, without exhibiting the *evidence* on which their conviction rests. It is proposed, therefore, in what follows, to *produce the evidence*, which goes to satisfy our minds, that leading Unitarians in the United States, with possibly a few exceptions, *do believe the doctrine of Universal Salvation, and are, in every thing but the name, UNIVERSALISTS.*

Unitarians have commonly denied the charge of Universalism, and resented the imputation of it as a reproach and a slander. When Dr. McLeod, a few years since, was understood to charge Unitarians with being Universalists, the Rev. H. Ware Jr., in his Letters to him, calls this an 'unfounded, cruel accusation'—'*thoroughly false*'—an 'injurious slander.' p. 22. When a writer, under the signature of Hollis, represented that Dr. Ware 'had declared himself a Universalist with an explicitness which need not be misunderstood,' he publicly 'denied the charge,' declaring

* Mr. Ballou published his 'Treatise on Atonement' in 1803. He 'became a Unitarian,' he tells us, *long before this*. Mod. Hist. of Universalism, p. 437.

it 'to be false;' and so great was the excitement among Unitarians on that occasion, growing (as one would naturally think) out of an utter rejection and abhorrence of Universalism, that Hollis was well nigh overwhelmed with the torrent of their abuse. He was called 'an unprincipled person;' 'a bigoted, gloomy screech-owl;' a 'wolf in sheep's clothing.' He was charged with 'narrow-mindedness and malignity;' with uttering 'subtle and mean insinuations,' and 'slandorous imputations;' with 'a degree, not only of barbarism, but of moral turpitude, which we want words to express.' In short, the whole representation respecting Dr. Ware, was declared to be 'an egregious, wanton *falsehood*.*' Mr. Pierpont, in his sermon at Northfield, 'on Retribution,' (pp. 17, 18,) undertook to repel the charge that Unitarians are Universalists. And in the Unitarian periodicals, the same course has been almost uniformly pursued. The conductors of the *Christian Register*, a few years since, professed to be greatly alarmed at the progress of Universalism, wrote much against it, represented it as a fruit of Calvinism, and denounced it as 'directly contrary to the plainest declarations of the holy Gospel,' as 'most injurious to the interests of good morals, and to the welfare of civil society,' and 'as fatally dangerous to the souls of men.†' The same paper has recently denied that 'Unitarians are Universalists, *in the sense in which the term is applied to the class who maintain the doctrine of the final restoration of all men to virtue and happiness.*‡'

Were the evidence on the point proposed to be established any thing less than *conclusive*, these oft-repeated, long continued, solemn denials might be considered as a bar to further proceeding. As the case stands, we have only to request that they be kept in mind, and compared with the statements which are to follow.

What is Universalism? What must a man believe or reject, in order to constitute him a Universalist? These obviously are radical questions, and require, in the outset, to be considered and determined.

To make a man a Universalist, it is not necessary that he should wholly reject the idea of future retribution—of future punishment. On this point professed Universalists have been, and are, divided among themselves. Hartley, Winchester, and Vidler were Universalists; yet they all believed in a state of punishment after death. The same may be said of Dean, Loveland, Wood, Hudson, and many other professed Universalists in the United States.‖ The following definitions of Universalists have been given by standard writers on the subject.

NICHOLSON. 'The term Universalists is used to designate those

* See Facts and Documents in relation to Harvard College, pp. 5—24.

† See Numbers for May 21, June 4, and Sept. 24, 1824. ‡ October 31, 1829.

‖ See Whittemore's Mod. Hist. of Universalism, pp. 434—442.

Christians who hold the doctrine of *the future restoration of all men to eternal life and happiness.***

ADAM. 'Universalists do not hold an exemption from future punishment, but merely *the recovery of all those that shall have been exposed to it.*'†

BUCK. 'Universalists are those who suppose that, as Christ died for all, so, before he shall have delivered up his mediatorial kingdom to the Father, *all* shall be brought to a participation of the benefits of his death, in their *restoration to holiness and happiness.*'‡

MISS H. ADAMS describes those as Universalists, who believe that such as 'have proved incurable under the means which have been used with them in this state, instead of being happy in the next, will be *awfully miserable*; not to continue so *finally*, but that they may be convinced of their folly, and recovered to a virtuous frame of mind.'§

With these descriptions of Universalists, leading members of the sect agree.

"There is no difference," says Mr. Ballou, "in the *principle* contended for by those Universalists, who believe in a state of limited punishment in a future state, and that maintained by those who believe that sin and its punishment are in the same state. Both believe that *all punishment is designed for the good of the punished.* In this, *all Universalists agree.*"||

'The doctrine of a *limited future punishment,*' Mr. Whittemore informs us, 'has never excited a very general interest' among Universalists. 'For twenty years, a difference of opinion has existed on this point; but the difference has not been the cause of alienation of feeling, or disruption of fellowship.'¶

The fact that Universalists include, not only those who deny future punishment, but all who believe in a *final universal restoration*, has been often admitted by Unitarians. A full account of the differences and discussions between Universalists on this point was published in the *Christian Register* for Feb. 7, 1823. Recently, also, it has been said in the same paper, 'The Universalists are divided into two sects, who agree in the belief that all men will ultimately be partakers of happiness, but who differ upon the inquiry, whether the commencement of this state of happiness will be cotemporary with the entrance of each soul upon a future life.'**

In the *Christian Examiner* it is also asserted, '*The great body of Universalists, as we are informed, now believe in a FUTURE RETRIBUTION.*'††

After what has been here stated, there can be no dispute as to the signification of the term, Universalist. It includes all who hold the doctrine of Universal Salvation, whether this salvation is believed immediately to follow death, or not to be fully accomplished

* Encyclopedia, Art. Universalists.

† Theological Dictionary.

|| Universalist Magazine, March 10, 1821.

** Oct. 31, 1829.

† Religious World Displayed.

§ View of Religions.

¶ Mod. Hist. of Universalism, p. 434.

†† Jan. 1830, p. 354.

till some future period. Those are Universalists who believe that all suffering ceases with the present life ; and those are equally Universalists, who believe in a state of future, disciplinary punishment, from which all shall be finally restored to the favor of God and the enjoyment of heaven.

We now proceed to exhibit the proof, that leading Unitarians in the United States (with possibly a few exceptions) are, in this latter sense, Universalists.

1. It is worthy to be noticed, that Unitarianism, in modern times, has almost invariably been connected with Universalism. It is so in Germany. Semler, Gruner, Eberhard, Steinbart, Damm, Fuller, and probably all the German Unitarians, of the last generation as well as the present, are Universalists.* The Unitarians of Geneva, if we may credit the French Encyclopedists, are Universalists. 'They believe in the existence of future punishment, but of *limited duration*.' The Unitarians of England and Scotland are also Universalists. Much has been said and written in this vicinity, in praise of the English Unitarians. Their works have been republished ; their periodicals imported and circulated ; and their names, numbers, and alleged successes have been spoken of with exultation. It should be known, therefore, to all concerned, that these English Unitarians, with scarcely an exception, are open Universalists. Dr. Priestley was a Universalist. He advocated it while living, and made it a ground of consolation in death. 'We shall *all* meet finally. We only require different degrees of discipline, suited to our different tempers, to prepare us for final happiness.†' Lindsey was a Universalist. In his 'Conversations on Divine Government' he compares the doctrine of endless punishment to 'a millstone which some mistaken Christians hang about the neck of the Gospel.‡' Dr. Jebb was a Universalist. 'Future punishments,' says he, 'as considered by our divines, are a kind of transportation, where the sufferings are horrible, but afford no useful documents.' 'Intolerants, and persons who maintain eternal punishment and atonement, are more unfit for society than atheists. This the judgement of some.'§ Kenrick, author of the Commentary recently published and circulated in Boston, was a Universalist. 'He thought that even the intensest sufferings of the transgressor will be corrective and remedial, and issue finally in universal order, happiness and virtue.¶' Richard Wright, the famous Unitarian Missionary, in whose praise so much has been said,¶ was 'first Pastor of a congregation of Universalists in Wisbeach,' and later in life, became a travelling Universalist minister.** Thomas Belsham was a Universalist. 'We may *certainly conclude*,' he says, 'that none

* See Erskine's Sketches of Church History, vol. 1.

† Memoirs, vol. i. p. 217. ‡ See Memoirs, p. 426. § Works, vol. ii. pp. 152, 145.

¶ Exposition, vol. i. p. 6.

¶ See Chris. Ex'r. vol. ii. p. 437, and Chris. Reg'r. for Sept. 17 and 24, 1825.

** See Modern Hist. of Universalism, p. 265.

of the creatures of God, in any circumstances, will be eternally miserable.* Carpenter and Cappe were Universalists. 'All,' says the latter, 'must end well at last. Pain must cease; error must have an end; vice must be extirpated; death must be destroyed.†' Robert Aspland, for many years editor of the *Monthly Repository*, and more recently editor of the *Christian Reformer*, is a Universalist. 'We rejoice,' says he, 'in the fact, that the Unitarians are *universally* agreed, in rejecting the doctrine of endless torment.‡'

The point to be illustrated by these facts is this, that Unitarianism has almost invariably existed in connexion with Universalism. Wherever there has been the former, there also has been the latter. It may be said, we know, that this is only *presumptive* evidence that American Unitarians are now Universalists; yet, under all the circumstances of the case, is not the presumption well nigh irresistible? Let the reader bear in mind, especially, the very intimate connexion subsisting between the Unitarians of this country, and those of England, who are open Universalists—the deep sympathy continually manifested—the unmeasured adulation mutually bestowed; and he will find it hard to believe that those of America, pretend what they will, are not inwardly in the same sentiment.§

2. The views of theology entertained by Unitarians and Universalists in this country are in general the *same*,—without excepting those points from which, the latter derive the doctrine of Universal Salvation. Both agree in rejecting those views of the holiness and justice of God, of his hatred of sin as exhibited in the cross of Christ, of the extent and strictness of the divine law, and of the entire depravity of man, from which results the doctrine of eternal punishment. Both agree also in maintaining those views of the character of God, of what they call his *parental* character, of his impartial goodness, his designs of mercy to all his creatures, and of the native purity and dignity of human nature, from which Universal Salvation is usually derived. On this point, the author of the sermon before us is explicit.

"There seems to be no ground for supposing that they (the Unitarian doctors) *do not know*, that the tenets of their faith, which they openly avow, both in their preaching and writing, do in fact *necessarily* lead to the belief of Universal Salvation." p. 10.

Indeed, it is undeniable, that the theology of American Unitarians and Universalists is essentially the *same*. In the language of 'a New York Unitarian,' 'both sects are firm believers in the doctrine of the divine Unity, and equally advocate the *same spiritual and rational*

* Review of Wilberforce, Let. ii.

† Discourses on Providence, p. 206.

‡ *Monthly Repository*, vol. iv. p. 341.

§ 'American Unitarians, as a *sect*, are the same as the English Unitarians. There is a strong feeling of oneness, of *identity*, in all they say of each other. The English and American Unitarians are as much *one sect*, as the English and American Calvinists, or Methodists. But is it not fair to infer, that the *same sects* hold the *same opinions*?' Letters of Canonius, p. 142.

*views of the character and mission of Jesus Christ.** But will it be believed, that those who thus agree in their premises, should not agree also in their conclusions? Will it be believed that those who unite with Universalists in rejecting those points of doctrine on which eternal punishment is supposed to rest, and in admitting others from which Universal Salvation is derived, are not themselves also Universalists?

3. Numerous extracts may be taken from the sermons and other writings of leading Unitarians, which necessarily imply Universal Salvation. The following is from a sermon of Dr. Channing at the ordination of Rev. Mr. Sparks at Baltimore.

"We believe that God is infinitely good, kind, benevolent in the proper sense of these words; good in disposition, as well as in act; good, not to a few, but to all; good to *every individual*, as well as to the general system." "We believe that he, (Christ) was sent by the Father, to effect a *moral or spiritual deliverance of MANKIND*; that is, to *rescue men*,' (the race,) '*from sin, and its consequences, and to bring them to a state of everlasting purity.*' pp. 16, 19.

In his sermon at the dedication of the second Congregational Unitarian Church in New York, Dr. Channing says,

"There is no good too vast for us to anticipate, for the *universe*, or for our selves, from such a Father as we believe in. The horrible thought of a large proportion of our fellow creatures being cast, by an angry God, into tortures unutterable by human tongue, and sentenced to spend eternity in shrieks of agony, which will never reach the ear or touch the heart of their Creator; this dreadful anticipation, which would shroud the universe in more than sepulchral gloom, and is enough to break every heart which is not stone—this forms no part of our conception of the *purposes and government* of the God and Father of Jesus Christ." See pp. 38—43.

This, Mr. Ballou very justly calls *Universalism*. 'For myself,' says he, 'I know not how the doctrine could be more fully stated, or more acceptably commended.'†

In Dr. Channing's sermon at the installation of Rev. Mr. Motte, we have the following sentiment :

"Ask multitudes what is the chief evil from which Christ came to save them, and they will tell you 'from *hell*, from *penal fires*, from *future punishment*.' That word, *hell*, which is so seldom used in the sacred pages, which, as critics will tell you, does not occur once in the writings of Paul, and Peter, and John, which we meet only in four or five discourses of Jesus, and which all persons acquainted with Jewish geography know to be a metaphor, a figure of speech, and not a literal expression,—this word, by a perverse and exaggerated use, has done unspeakable injury to Christianity. It has possessed and diseased men's imaginations with outward tortures, shrieks and flames," and "given them an idea of an outward ruin, as what they have chiefly to dread." p. 20.

Would any person, not a Universalist—any one who believed that the wicked, in the other world, would "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power"—have thrown out a representation, so strange, so unguarded, so unfounded as this!

The following is from the sermon of the same writer, at the ordination of Rev. Mr. Farley.

* The Olive Branch and Christian Inquirer for May 17, 1828.

† Universalist Magazine for March 17, 1827.

"How far the Supreme Being may communicate his attributes to his intelligent offspring, I stop not to inquire. But that his almighty goodness will impart to them" (his *intelligent offspring, without distinction*) "powers and GLORIES of which the material universe is but a faint emblem, I cannot doubt." "This name (Father) belongs to God, because he frames spirits like himself, and delights to give them" (his intelligent creatures without distinction) "what is *most glorious and blessed in his own nature*."—God "looks down upon us" (mankind) "with parental interest, and" his "*great design is to communicate to us forever, in freer and fuller streams, his own power, goodness and joy*." Of certain alleged exhibitions of human nature, in the *general*, Dr. C says, "These are marks of a divine origin, and the pledges of a *celestial inheritance*, and I thank God that my own lot is bound up with that of the HUMAN RACE." pp. 17—27.

From these and similar expressions scattered through the writings of Dr. Channing, it cannot be doubted that he is a believer in Universal Salvation; and it is no improper use of terms to denominate him a Universalist.

We give the following extract from the Letters of Dr. Ware "to Trinitarians and Calvinists"—the same which has been so often quoted in proof of the Universalism of the Hollis Professor. Addressing those who hold and advocate the doctrine of *eternal* punishment, he says,

"If you endeavor to enhance the fear of punishment, by representations of its severity, or of its *duration*, far disproportioned to what can be the apprehension of the demerit, to which it is to be applied; if you carry it beyond the bounds of probability, that the threat will be executed; if it be such, that to a reflecting mind it is *impossible it should be executed by a just, and good, and merciful being, the Parent of the creation*; you weaken its effects as a motive; you lose in probability, and the firmness of faith, more than you gain in the force of fear.

"The surest and highest, the purest and most permanent influence will be that, which arises from such views of the future punishment awaiting the wicked, as are consistent with the character of a sovereign of the world, who has nothing vindictive in his nature, who adjusts punishment to the degree of demerit, who inflicts it solely for the purpose of promoting holiness, and accomplishing the purposes of his moral government, and only to the degree which these purposes require, and *so long* as they require it.

"From these considerations, I am persuaded that the moral influence of the views of future reward and punishment, maintained generally by Unitarians, is far more certain, and powerful, and salutary, and purifying, than that which is the result of the Orthodox views on this subject.* And I am persuaded of this by another consideration still. It is this:—the virtue that is produced by cheerful views, and by the contemplation of kindness, benevolence, and mercy in God, is of a more pure, generous and elevated kind, than that which arises from cold, austere, and gloomy views, and the contemplation of severe, unrelenting, vindictive justice, and the execution of *eternal* wrath." pp. 131, 132.

It will be observed, that Dr. Ware here gives us, not his own views merely, but those "maintained *GENERALLY by Unitarians*." We shall institute no labored inquiry as to the *meaning* of the above extract; for it admits of none. It is manifest Universalism, and so it has been considered by all parties, that, of the writer alone excepted. So it was considered by Dr. Woods in his Reply.

"Dr. Ware seems to think it *impossible to believe* the doctrine of endless punishment. Doubtless he speaks of an impossibility which *Unitarians* feel;

* The Orthodox hold to *eternal* punishment: In what do the views of Unitarians differ, unless they hold to a *limited* punishment, and so are Universalists?

for he surely would not charge us with insincerity, when we profess to believe the doctrine. Now I admit that Unitarians may find it difficult or impossible to bring themselves to believe the doctrine of endless punishment. With the same habits of thinking on religious subjects which they have, I should find it impossible too. But there can be no doubt that this doctrine would become perfectly credible to Unitarians, if their view of the law and government of God, and the evil of sin, should be like those which the Orthodox entertain.' "

To this understanding of his sentiments, Dr. Ware, in his rejoinder, makes no objection. He tacitly admits that Dr. Woods understood him correctly. It may be added, that he was understood in the same sense by professed Universalists. In commenting on the passage above quoted, the editor of the *Universalist Magazine* observes,

"Our readers will be happy to learn, not only that the Rev. Dr. (Ware) is in fact a Universalist, but that he thinks himself authorized to represent the *great body of Unitarians as agreeing with him in this sentiment.*" "His principle is nothing different from the sentiments of Universalists." March 10, 1821.

The practice of *praying for those who have died in sin*, which is now advocated and adopted by some leading Unitarians, necessarily implies a belief that they may be restored, and made forever happy. On this subject, we give the following extract from a sermon by Mr. Pierpont.

"Shall we not go still further, and believe that He who ever bows his ear to his children's requests, will open it to the prayer which a child of earth offers him, that a brother who has sunk into the grave, even without hope, may yet find favor with his Judge,—the favor that shall pity—shall uphold—shall bring him up from the fearful depths into which he has sunk, and make him still a partaker of immortal life."*

The following passages are from a tract, '*on Christian Salvation*, by Bernard Whitman,' lately published by the American Unitarian Association.

"He (God) must have created us *SOLELY for our own enjoyment*; because he is infinite love."—"If he has subjected us to continual temptation; and if he has encouraged an insatiable longing for future existence, is it not clear from the very perfections of his character, that he will provide the means of escape from iniquity, and open before us the portals of immortality, and furnish us with opportunities for the perfection of our spiritual nature"?—"If love prompted him to create intelligent offspring, that same affection must ever dispose him to regard them with tenderness; and to be their *eternal Benefactor, Preserver, Father, and Saviour*."—"And universal experience has thus far declared, that the Lord is good to all, and that his tender mercies are over all the works of his hands; and consequently, he must remain the *UNIVERSAL and supreme Saviour.*" pp. 11, 12, 13.

Here again, is palpable Universalism—in which the writer is not alone implicated, but the *whole Unitarian Association*, in whose name, and by whose authority, this tract is published and circulated.

4. American Unitarians have long been in the practice of publishing, circulating, and recommending books which inculcate universal salvation.—The "*Improved Version*," (so called) "of

* Sermon on the Intercession of Christ. p. 12.

the New Testament," published in Boston in 1809, and highly recommended in the General Repository,* (edited by Professor Norton) is a work of this character. If any doubt whether those who prepared this work were Universalists, let them consult the notes on the following passages: Matt. xxv. 46. Rom. v. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Rev. xiv. 11, and xx. 10. The author of these notes certainly was in earnest to explain away what he calls "the heart withering doctrine of eternal torments."—Another work of a similar character is Kenrick's "Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament." The principles of Kenrick, who we have seen was a Universalist, are exhibited in this Commentary without disguise. In his remarks upon Matt. xxv. 46, he speaks "of the *utter inconsistency* of the creature's enduring eternal misery, and all our ideas of the Divine mercy and goodness;" and "of the *disproportion* between the offence and the punishment." He says, "a punishment may, in a popular and scriptural sense be said to be *eternal*, if it last for a *very long and indefinite period*." This work, it is well known, has been lately published in Boston—has been received with an almost unqualified approbation by Unitarians†—and is industriously circulated.

Under this head should be mentioned, also, the English Unitarian Periodicals. The public need not be informed with what eagerness these are received and read, and how highly they have been recommended, by Unitarians in this country. But these works, we believe without an exception, are enlisted in favor of Universal salvation. The author of the "Modern History of Universalism," speaking of the Monthly Repository, says,

"We confess, with pleasure, that we have derived more assistance from this work, in relation to the History of Universalism, than from any other.—The Christian Reflector, a smaller work published at Liverpool, has contained some fine articles in defence of Universalism. The same may be said of the Christian Reformer, at Hackney, under the care of Rev. Robert Aspland." "The Rev. George Harris, editor of the Christian Pioneer, printed at Glasgow, is a decided believer in *Universal restitution*." pp. 274, 180.

Our readers will judge, whether those who so highly recommend works which advocate Universal salvation, and are at so much expense and pains to procure, publish, and circulate them, are not themselves, Universalists.

5. We may appeal to decisive acts of American Unitarians, which can be explained on no other supposition than that of their

* "We honestly profess, and without fear of losing reputation with those whose good opinion we are very solicitous to retain, that we think it (the "Improved Version,") a work *highly respectable, and adapted to be very useful*. Its editors, have produced a version *FAR more faithful, more correct, and more intelligible, than that in common use*—a version, therefore, to an intelligent English reader of *very great value*." vol. iii, p. 207.

† The American publishers of Kenrick say, in their advertisement, "This work has been published at the recommendation of *many gentlemen, both of the clergy and laity, as the best Unitarian Commentary extant*."—The conductors of the Christian Register also say, "We know of no other commentary in the English language *worthy to be compared with it, for popular use*." See Chris. Reg. May 24, and July 5, 1828.

being Universalists.—Such an act was the union of “the Olive Branch” and “Christian Inquirer,” (the former a Universalist paper, conducted by Mr. Kneeland, and the latter a Unitarian paper conducted by Mr. Bates) in the city of New York, in the spring of 1828. How could these papers be harmoniously united, unless, among those who patronised them, there was, substantially, an agreement in sentiment? Indeed, in the first number of the united paper, such an agreement is avowed by “a New York Unitarian,” as the ground and basis of the union.

“*Both denominations believe in the final restoration of all men to virtue and happiness. It is true a few Unitarians may believe in the Orthodox doctrine of eternal misery, and a small number also may be the advocates of the annihilation of the finally impenitent; yet the great mass of Unitarians both in this country and in Europe boldly avow their disbelief of eternal misery and their firm persuasion of the restoration of mankind to holiness and happiness. So obvious is this fact, that there is no publication of any Unitarian of respectability, but what discloses these views, and it is one of the charges of unsoundness of faith which is brought against them by their Orthodox opponents.*” “*That there is a difference of opinion between Unitarians and some Universalists as to the time when it (universal restoration) will take place, I freely confess; but that they agree in the ultimate destination of man to virtue and happiness, all must allow.*”

Another act, to be noticed in this connection, is the installation of Mr. Turner at Charlton. Mr. Turner had been for years a professed Universalist minister. While laboring as a Universalist in Portsmouth, N. H., he was invited “to settle over the Unitarian society in Charlton.” With this invitation he complied, and by a large and respectable Unitarian Council, called for the purpose, who, we are told, “*did not ask him a question concerning his faith,*” he was installed, and received from them the right-hand of fellowship.* What is the language of this transaction? The Council had every reason to suppose that Mr. Turner was at this time a Universalist (as we shall show that he was;) and yet they manifest, before the world, and in the most public and solemn manner, that they have *no objection to him on this account.* They pronounce “the testimonials in regard to his private and *professional character entirely satisfactory,*” and openly acknowledge and embrace him as a *good minister*, who will teach the way of God in truth.

The fellowship existing formerly, if not now, between the Unitarians and Universalists in Philadelphia, can hardly be accounted for but upon the supposition that they were agreed in sentiment. In a letter from Philadelphia to England, dated May 6, 1819, the writer says,

“We do not now stand alone in this city as Unitarians. You may recollect the Universalist church in Lombard street. Last fall, a Mr. Abner Kneeland was introduced, as a preacher, into that church. Mr. Kneeland is a Humani-

* The services on this occasion were performed by the Rev. Dr. Bancroft of Worcester, and the Rev. Messrs. Allen of Northborough, Noyes of Brookfield, Walker of Charlestown, Huntoon of Canton, Thompson of Barre, May of Brooklyn, and Osgood of Sterling. Chris. Reg. June 28, 1828.

tarian, and such a Universalist as Dr. Priestley." The writer proceeds to say, that Mr. Kneeland "uses the same hymns which are used in our church, and in the Unitarian church in Baltimore, and commonly attends worship with us one part of the day on Sunday."*

Does not this look as though the Unitarians and Universalists were substantially agreed?

The Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Boston has recently visited the Western States, and preached several times at Cincinnati. Of his labors in that city, a Universalist paper published there, Nov. 21, 1829, gives the following account.

"The services of the Rev. John Pierpont, a Unitarian clergyman from Boston, Mass., now in this city, have been principally attended, for several Sabbaths past, at the first Universalist church, by crowded, attentive, and (judging others by *ourselves* we venture to say) *highly gratified congregations.*" "His discourses, without exception, have been *eminently calculated to do good.*" "The lecture on Sabbath afternoon, which we had the pleasure of hearing, was, in our judgement, 'in ALL POINTS LIKE AS WE (Universalists) ARE'—*only without the name.*"†

6. We have conclusive proof of a general agreement in sentiment between Unitarians and Universalists, in the fact that individuals pass from one denomination to the other, *without any change of sentiment.* When, from a Universalist, Mr. Turner became a Unitarian, did he experience any change of sentiment? He shall answer for himself. In a letter to one of the editors of the Universalist Magazine, dated Portsmouth, Nov. 20, 1827, he writes,

"DEAR BROTHER—You have doubtless heard of my invitation to settle over the Unitarian society in Charlton. The members of that society are mostly, if not entirely restorationists. Their call is unanimous. . . . If I accept this invitation, *I neither retract nor renounce any doctrine I now hold, but shall feel at liberty to preach as I do in other places.* Under such circumstances, would there be a gross impropriety in complying with the request? Should I be less likely to do good, by *preaching the doctrine which I endeavor to support (Universalism) under another name than that which I now bear?*"

After his installation, Mr. Turner also says,

* Monthly Repository, vol. xiv. p. 458.

† By a private account from Cincinnati, we are informed (in the phraseology of the country,) that one of the editors of this Universalist paper "*did Mr. Pierpont's prayers.*" Mr. P., it seems, *did* the preaching, and the Universalist minister the praying.

We might here refer to a recent discussion in the legislature of Massachusetts, in which leading Unitarians and Universalists cordially *united* to prevent the incorporation of the American Temperance Society, as evidence that the two denominations cannot be, in sentiment, very wide asunder. Mr. Saltonstall and Doct. Brooks, (whose names ought to descend to posterity together,) with their several coadjutors, *united*, and put forth all their strength, to paisy the energies, restrain the influence, and hinder the usefulness of a society, which has done more, confessedly, than any other in this land, to check the vices which most threaten us, quench the fire of intemperance, and dash the intoxicating bowl from the lips of the self-destroyer—a Society, the story of whose successes has crossed the Atlantic, and is now told, with admiration, in the centre of Europe. Yet this Society must be assailed, denied incorporation, and left an outlaw, because, forsooth, some of its principal directors and supporters are Orthodox! 'You do us honor overmuch.' It might have been thought invidious before, to couple the glorious cause of *temperance*, the object and successes of this noble Society, with the name of Orthodoxy. We thank Mr. Saltonstall, and his Rev. colleague, for the honor they have done us. Henceforth we trust there will be no complaint, if the two things they have united, Orthodoxy and Temperance, are sometimes spoken of as holding to each other the intimate relation of cause and effect.

"That he has experienced *no change in his religious views, and that he takes charge of the society in Charlton, without any sacrifice or renunciation of the principles for which, during thirty years, he has contended.*"*

Mr. Turner, then, in passing from Universalism to Unitarianism, *changed nothing but the name.*

More recently, Rev. Mr. Brimblecom, a Unitarian minister, first at Sharon, (Mass.) and afterwards at Norridgewock, (Me.) has become a professed Universalist. Has he experienced any change of sentiment? Not at all. He insists, as we are informed from several sources, that he holds to the same principles now that he did before, preaches the same doctrine, and has merely (for reasons which to him appeared satisfactory) changed his connections and his name.

The greater part of Mr. Turner's congregation at Charlton were formerly professed Universalists, in connection with the Universalist society in that place. Now they have changed their name, and become professed Unitarians. Have they changed anything more than their name? No: For Mr. Turner says, in the letter already quoted, "The members of that society (at Charlton) *are mostly, if not entirely, Restorationists.*"

Our readers must judge, whether, between two denominations, from which ministers and societies may pass either way, without changing more than a name, there can be any material or general diversity of sentiment.

7. It may seem superfluous to adduce the testimony of the Orthodox in proof of the point under consideration; as one of the complaints urged against them is, that "they charge Unitarians with being Universalists, *to serve a turn.*"† We may be excused, however, in bringing forward a single witness, whose testimony seems entitled to more than ordinary regard. He was formerly a Unitarian, having every opportunity of acquaintance with the views of his brethren, who renounced his connection with them in the autumn of 1827.

"The Unitarian body," says he, "are divided in opinion on this subject. I HAVE NEVER KNOWN ONE OF THEM, *however, who professes positively to believe in the eternity of future punishment.* A few believe in annihilation, and the GREAT MAJORITY in final restoration." . . . "The Unitarians generally do not differ, as I can find, from a large class of Universalists, who believe in final restoration. Would not an union take place between these parties, if the Unitarians considered it as a matter of policy so to do?"‡

The Unitarian clergyman, to whom this was addressed, in his reply, did not contradict it, nor say anything to invalidate or disprove the statement here made.

8. In establishing the point under consideration, our next witnesses shall be professed Universalists.—The Rev. H. Ballou thus writes in the Universalist Magazine for June 1, 1822.

* See Universalist Magazine for July 11 and August 15, 1825.

† Christian Examiner.

‡ Letter to a Unitarian Clergyman, p. 17.

"I have attended the Thursday Lectures at Chauncey place in this city,* a number of times, and for the most part have been greatly edified with sound, learned discourses." "*I have heard the doctrine of Universal salvation as conclusively proved, by a course of refined reasoning, and lucid deductions from scriptural premises, as I ever heard in my life.* And it gave me no small satisfaction to be *fully convinced* that the learned preachers (Unitarians) who thus labored, *fully understood themselves*, and not only so, but *meant to be understood by their hearers.*"

The same writer, in "an address to Unitarians," May 14, 1825, says,

"If I do not entirely misunderstand you, when I hear you preach, you frequently make plain and clear statements, which are not only *consistent with Universalism*, but *most pointedly opposed to the unmerciful doctrine of endless punishment.*"

Again, it is said, in the same work,

"We know, that no *two denominations in Christendom agree more nearly in sentiment, than Unitarians and Universalists.*"†

9. It remains that we present the confessions of *Unitarians themselves*, as to their belief of Universal Salvation.

The Rev. Barnabas Bates, a Unitarian clergyman in the State of New York, thus writes to the editor of the Universalist Magazine :

"In common with *many Unitarians*, both in this country and Europe, I have rejected the cruel and unscriptural doctrine of endless misery, and embraced the sentiment that *all men will be finally restored to virtue and happiness.*"‡

From the same paper it appears, that Rev. Mr. Upham of Salem has declared himself a Universalist. In a letter from Salem, signed L. W. (the initials of Lemuel Willis, Universalist minister in that place) it is stated that 'he (Mr. Upham) has *avowed to the writer of this article (L. W.) that he believed in the restoration of all mankind.*'‡

We are told also in the same paper, of "a Unitarian clergyman, settled about thirty miles from Boston, who thus addressed, privately, a Universalist : 'Well, my friend, betwixt you and me, I will tell you, that *I agree with you in sentiment*, and *I have believed your sentiment for a long time.* We ought to join to PUT DOWN THE CALVINISTS.'"‡

A Unitarian Clergyman in this vicinity has recently been heard to say, that 'rather than believe the doctrine of eternal punishment, he would reject the inspiration of the Scriptures.'

Respecting another, a gentleman of the strictest veracity observes,

* These Lectures—a continuation of the ancient Thursday lecture in Boston, which *once* excited so much attention—have fallen latterly into the hands of Unitarians, and have dwindled as near to nothing as they well can, and be continued. They remind us of a University Lecture spoken of by Wakefield, at which "the preacher exhibited only to the Vice Chancellor, the Beadle, Mr. Blue-Coat, and the walls. Should a spectator," says he, "come to a station under the eastern gallery, the preacher alone would be exposed to his view, and would possibly remind him of Amphion exerting his powers on the stones, or of a 'voice crying in the wilderness.'" *Memoirs of Gilbert Wakefield*, vol. i. p. 151.

† Number for Nov. 22, 1822.

‡ See Nos. for Feb. 13, 1830 ; Aug. 15, 1829 ; and Feb. 25, 1826.

"I can speak unhesitatingly. I have heard him advance the doctrine of Universal Salvation in public, and I have heard him deny our views of future punishment in private conversation." "I know, furthermore, that a considerable part of his supporters are Universalists."

To the evidence here presented, we add the following, derived from the publications of Unitarians.

In an article in the *Christian Disciple*, supposed to have been written by Rev. Mr. Walker, of Charlestown,* we have this statement :

"If by everlasting punishment is meant the proper eternity of hell torments, it is a doctrine which *most Unitarians at the present day concur in rejecting*; some understanding by that everlasting destruction to which the wicked are to be consigned, an absolute annihilation; others, conceiving of their sufferings as consequential and indefinite as to their duration," (not eternal) "and others, that all punishment will be remedial, and will end at last in a universal restoration to goodness and happiness." vol. iii. p. 451.

In the 'Letters to Dr. Miller, by a Unitarian of Baltimore,' the writer avows his rejection of eternal punishment, and argues in favor of Universal Salvation.

"How can you reconcile those attributes" (of God) "with the idea of his having doomed a *certain number of his creatures to an endless misery*, a state and degree of suffering which bear no proportion to any amount of crimes that a finite and frail creature is capable of committing?"†

In the last volume of the *Unitarian Miscellany*, edited by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood now of Boston, is an *editorial* article 'on the Future Life and Condition of Man.' 'The four prominent doctrines,' says the writer, 'which are held on this subject, are the eternal damnation or misery of the unrighteous; the annihilation of the wicked; the immediate salvation of all; and the final restoration of all.' These several theories Mr. Greenwood examines, in their order. 'The doctrine of eternal punishment,' he represents, at large, as 'revolting' and 'shocking,' as inconsistent with 'the character of God,' and with 'the true design and end of punishment.' 'The doctrine of the final extermination of the wicked,' he holds 'to be nearly as irrational, if not quite, as that of endless misery. It is not so revolting to the feelings,' but 'it militates equally against the perfect attributes of the Creator.' Mr. Greenwood next examines and rejects the notion of 'the *immediate* salvation of all;' and, lastly, he considers and *advocates* 'the doctrine of *universal restoration*.'

"It is founded on our most enlightened and enlarged conceptions of the attributes of God, of his moral government, and of the faculties of man;" (nothing said about the Bible) 'and on grounds thus immovable, it affirms, that *not one human being will finally be lost*.' 'They (the wicked) will at last be *reclaimed to virtue and happiness*.' 'The final happiness of *all mankind* was designed by the goodness, is planned by the omniscience, and will be accomplished by the omnipotence, of him who gave them life." pp. 113—133.

Mr. Greenwood will perhaps feel injured, and his friends may be angry, if we denominate him a Universalist, and suggest to him

* See *Universalist Magazine* for July 12, 1823.

† *Un. Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. 32.

the propriety of an exchange of pulpits with the Universalist ministers of Boston. But is he not a Universalist? And why should he not exchange services with his brethren of the same faith?

In the same volume of the Unitarian Miscellany, another writer, under the signature of J. T., opposes the doctrine of eternal punishment, and advocates universal restoration. p. 158.

From the first number of 'the Unitarian,' a periodical published at New York, and edited by Rev. William Ware of that city, we give the following extract, said to have been written by Mr. Ware himself.

"We do not believe the eternity of all future punishment of sin to be the doctrine either of Scripture or reason, and regard it as a tenet that has, in many respects, an unhappy influence on human conduct and character." 'We believe that the suffering of futurity' 'will be disciplinary, remedial, purifying, saving in its character, and will, consequently, *at some time, cease*; at *that time*, whenever it shall be, that the offenders shall be reformed by it,' and 'restored to the love and practice of virtue.'

We extract the following from 'the Christian Inquirer,' a Unitarian paper formerly published in the city of New York.

"In England, we all know, that several of the most zealous and useful Unitarian ministers publicly avow their belief in the final restoration of all men to happiness; and if I do not mistake, THIS IS THE BELIEF OF THE GREAT BODY OF UNITARIANS IN THIS COUNTRY. *Why then should we hesitate to avow our sentiments, especially on this subject*; or at least, would it not be good policy, if we wish success to the cause of liberal Christianity, to extend our sympathy and Christian intercourse to these brethren?"*

We have already quoted 'a New York Unitarian,' affirming that 'THE GREAT MASS OF UNITARIANS both in this country, and in Europe, boldly avow their *disbelief of eternal misery*, and *their firm persuasion of the restoration of mankind to holiness and happiness*;'—affirming, once and again, that on this point, *Unitarians and Universalists 'are agreed.'* p. 216.

The reviewer, of 'a Letter from a Gentleman in Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that city,' thinks it 'honorable' to the Unitarian 'party,' that *none* of them 'believe in the eternity of future punishment.'

"We hope no Unitarian will ever be found, to profess a doctrine so subversive of the most amiable attributes of the Deity, and so little supported by the revelations he has sent us." p. 23.

The Christian Register has lately published an extended article on the question, 'Are Unitarians Universalists?' in which, after denying that they are Universalists, even in the sense of restoration, the writer comes to the following conclusions: 1. He 'cannot name' the individual among Unitarians, 'who believes that the wicked shall be forever miserable.' 2. A few 'believe in annihilation.' 3. 'By a third and NUMEROUS body the belief is cherished, that *all men* will be ultimately reconciled to God and restored to his favor.' 4. The remainder 'believe that Christ has announced a painful retribution for the sinner, but that the consequences of this

* Quoted in the Universalist Magazine for Jan. 6, 1827.

retribution are among the secret things of God.*' We have yet to learn in what this latter class differ materially from the third. They believe that the wicked will be punished, but not forever. Their punishment, therefore, must have an end. In what? Annihilation or restoration? In one or the other of these it must end, if it end at all. And as the class in question do not believe in annihilation, their views must lead them, whether conscious of it or not, to fall in with the doctrine of restoration. If their Bibles leave them in darkness upon the subject, what they term 'Christian Philosophy' may come to their help, and the light (such as it is) of Universalism will beam upon them:

We close this array of confession and proof with another extract from the Christian Register.

"The doctrine of eternal torments is opposed to the benevolence of God, and cannot be a doctrine of Scripture."†

On comparing the evidence here exhibited with the repeated and solemn denials of Universalism, which Unitarians, at different times, have made, the conclusion will force itself upon the reader, that there has been *evasion, concealment* (to give it no worse name) in regard to this subject, as there formerly was in relation to the Trinity. This has often been charged upon Unitarians by Universalists, and others, and not unfrequently has been acknowledged by members of their own body. We are authorized, on the highest authority, to represent, that '*many* (Unitarians) who disbelieve the doctrine of eternal punishment, are AFRAID TO AVOW THEIR OPINION, lest it should weaken the restraints of religion.'‡ Another Unitarian already quoted, after expressing the opinion that universal restoration 'is the belief of the great body of Unitarians in this country,' asks, '*Why then should we hesitate to avow our sentiments explicitly upon this subject?*' implying that himself and his brethren had hesitated to make such an avowal. 'We think,' says another, that 'those Unitarians who believe in this doctrine, (universal restoration) 'have been much in fault in keeping it out of view, and EVADING THE CHARGE OF IT. *An open avowal of it would do them no discredit.*'|| We think so too. It is no discredit to be honest. It is discreditable to be a hypocrite—to pretend to one thing, and be another; but it can be no discredit to a public teacher of religion to be explicit and open, and frankly express to the world his views. If Unitarians are Universalists, why should they deny that such is the fact? Why should they endeavor to make their people believe (as Mr. Ballou declares that they do) that this is not the case? If they reject the doctrine of eternal punishment, why should they be

* Nos. for Oct. 31 and Dec. 12, 1829.

† March 6, 1830. The article containing this sentence appeared originally in the Christian Pioneer, but was republished in the Register without any mark of disapprobation.

‡ Bancroft's Sermons, p. 392.

|| Review of 'a Letter to a Unitarian Clergyman,' &c. p. 24.

afraid (as Dr. Bancroft will have it that many are) to preach their sentiments? If they believe in universal restoration, why should they be disposed (as one of their own friends expresses it) to 'keep it out of view, and evade the charge of it?' How much better to be honest, and acknowledge the truth, and not be afraid of names, and proclaim to the world (if such is their belief) that to *all* of every character, good and bad, the heavenly inheritance is ultimately sure? Concealment and management may answer for a time, and those who prosper by them may rejoice, and think themselves politic and happy, but honesty, after all, is the *best* policy;—and certainly no one ought to think himself *religious*, any further than he is conscious of cherishing and practising a down-right and universal honesty.

In view of this discussion, the inquiry possibly may arise in the minds of some of our readers—an inquiry always pertinent and important—'*Cui bono fuerit?* What good can grow out of it? Suppose Unitarians are Universalists; what then? If they are unwilling to take the name, why fasten it upon them? If they are unwilling to preach a doctrine which you believe to be false and dangerous, why should you find fault? What good can result from this discussion, and why was it engaged in?'

These very reasonable inquiries demand a full and direct answer; and we intend it shall be given. We say then, in the first place, that we have not engaged in this discussion with a view to fasten upon Unitarians an unmerited and unpopular name. Such an object would be wrong in itself; and if not wrong, it would be altogether unworthy of the labor we have bestowed. Besides, it does not appear that Universalist is not as honorable an appellation as Unitarian. For ourselves, were the sad alternative forced upon us, we should be at a loss which to prefer. We would as willingly bear the one as the other.

Nor have we engaged in this discussion, because it gives us *pleasure* to ascertain and prove, to satisfy ourselves and others, that Unitarians are Universalists. We regard the doctrine of Universal Salvation as a great and destructive error, contradicted by the express language of Scripture, injurious to the interests of morals and of society, and ruinous to the souls of men; and it affords us no pleasure, certainly, to see so many of our fellow immortals, some of them occupying conspicuous public stations, and drawing numbers around them and after them, falling into this flattering but fatal delusion. So far from this, were tears and sorrows sufficient to reclaim them, we could weep over them with tears of blood.

We have been induced to engage in this discussion that our readers, our fellow Christians, might be duly apprized of the dangers which surround them, and that the further spread of Universalism, so far as we have influence, might be prevented.

Unitarianism, it is well known, was introduced and propagated in this country by concealment; and the attempt has long been making to spread Universalism, by the same means. In former years, none would own that they were Unitarians; while in secret they were laboring to explode the ancient faith, and introduce their favorite error. Now, the same persons will not own that they are Universalists; while in most instances they secretly embrace the doctrine, and are laboring to prepare the way for its reception and prevalence. When the mask was torn off from abashed Unitarianism, and the heresy was exposed to public view, it was shorn at once of nearly all its power, and has since made but feeble progress. And should we be able, by any efforts, to bring forth Universalism from its lurking places, and convince our fellow Christians of impending dangers, we should feel that we had taken an important step towards helping them to escape the snare. Nothing is more to be dreaded than a powerful but *concealed* enemy, an enemy in the dark. Better, by all means, be apprized with whom and what we have to contend, that, knowing the amount of danger, we may know how to apportion and direct our efforts.

There can be no doubt that Universalism is to be the prominent heresy of our times. Openly advocated by many—embraced and connived at in secret by not a few—backed up also by learning, wealth, station and influence, it has grown, and flourished, and extended its blighting shade over some of the fairest portions of our land. Thousands and thousands are deluded by it, and while they live in worldliness, in pleasure, and perhaps in vice, are soothing themselves with the hope that some means will be provided, either in this world or the future, to secure to them the possession of everlasting joys. Thus probationary moments run to waste, opportunities are neglected, and privileges abused; while death is ever at his work, and deluded mortals are sinking to rise no more.

In these circumstances, what is to be done? Shall we shut our eyes, and fold our hands, and do nothing to expose or correct the evil? Our wily adversaries (and possibly some mistaken friends) would endeavor to persuade us to such a course. But in this case, the delusion would continue to spread; one church after another would fall before it; our spiritual enclosures would be desolated; and multitudes, living and yet to live, would be forever ruined. It is not unlikely that some good people may regard this whole discussion with disapprobation and disgust—may call it controversy—and may turn away their eyes from the dangers which it discloses. But they will bear in mind, that the evil will not be stayed, by being overlooked and despised; it will be upon them before they are aware of it; and too late they may send up the unavailing wish, that they had attended to it, and provided against it, in season.

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

MAY, 1830.

NO. 5.

COMMUNICATIONS.

OPINIONS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS RESPECTING
THE TRINITY.

No. 1. Introductory.

LORD BACON has an essay entitled, *Of Seeming Wise*. Were he alive now he would probably write one, *Of Seeming Learned*; for the latter is at present much the more common and more pernicious vice of the two. It is less easily detected; the circumstances of the age more encourage its growth; and its influence is more extensive. Shrewdness is so much more general than learning, that the *seeming wise* will be often liable to exposure where the *seeming learned* may practise their impositions with impunity. It is much easier for an unlettered man of good understanding to distinguish sound sense from prating nonsense, than to judge of the quality of a Greek quotation. The workings of his own mind have made him acquainted with the characteristics of common sense, but of Greek he has never learned even the letters.

In Lord Bacon's time, those only who were learned by profession took an interest in learned discussion. Every writer knew that his compositions would be subjected to the rigid scrutiny of practised eyes, and that he had little popular applause to expect as a compensation for the smart which he might feel from the critic's lash. Learned books were written only for the learned, who were capable of judging for themselves of the truth or falsehood of a writer's statements, and of the learning or ignorance which they might exhibit. Now the case is different. All classes of people read, and they read on all sorts of subjects. There is a general curiosity to know what can be said on almost every matter of discussion that is agitated in the learned world, while the study and intellectual discipline essential to the understanding of very many of these subjects sufficiently to enable one to appreciate

properly a writer's talent, information, and honesty, are quite beyond the reach of the greater number of readers. The advantage which the *seeming learned* may take of this circumstance, is too obvious to need further specification.

The state of public feeling renders it extremely difficult effectually to expose shallow and mischievous pretensions to learning. The community is divided into factions strongly opposed to each other ; and these divisions in many instances rest on questions not easily settled, and which cannot be accurately understood, nor profitably discussed, without extensive research. Even to estimate the value of any discussion respecting them, requires more previous knowledge than is generally supposed. The adherents of every party are disposed to receive the assertions of their favorite teachers with implicit faith, to rely on them as undoubted truth, (for this gives all the confidence and security of knowledge without the trouble of investigation) and to reject with contempt the reasonings of all others, because they see their leaders do the same. Let one, therefore, be ever so fairly convicted of ignorance or dishonesty, and his followers will set it down to sectarian hate on the part of the exposé ; or let one be ever so careful and well grounded in his statements, and his opponents will accuse him of swerving from the truth, and their accusations will be believed and applauded by those of their own party. This is not always to be imputed to blind zeal and disingenuousness, but very often, if not most generally, to a real want of the information requisite to the forming of a correct opinion. It requires solid learning to appreciate the strength of a learned appeal and thorough intellectual discipline to feel the point of an acute and elaborate argument. Richard Baxter, speaking of the reception which one of his works met with from the public, says, in his honest way : " This book pleased Dr. Hammond much, and many rational persons, and some of those for whom it was written ; but the women and weaker sort I found could not so well improve clear reason, as they can a few comfortable, warm, and pretty sentences ; it is style, and not reason, that doth most with them." (Life, part 1. p. 109.)

The subordinate members of a party are generally less prejudiced and more honest than the leaders ; they have never committed themselves so far, nor had their feelings so strongly enlisted. They would be willing to believe the truth, if they were not deceived ; but while those who have eyes will not use them, they who would use them if they had them, are blind. Ambition destroys the serpent, and credulity those whom the serpent beguiles.

A state of society like that which exists at the present day, imposes a fearful responsibility on all who write for the public eye ; and happy would it be for the interests of truth and righteousness if this responsibility were more deeply felt, and more generally re-

garded. Should every writer feel that he is accountable to a just and holy God for all the influence he exerts, for every sentence he composes, what a different tone and spirit would at once be diffused through the immense mass of reading which circulates in our community! How soon would party strife, and bitter reviling, and scoffing at things sacred cease, and the impure fountains of corruption and lust be closed, and, according to the prediction of the prophet, 'judgement run down our streets, as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream!' But we are far enough from having realized this happy period. It is melancholy to see how many there are, who, instead of taking advantage of the present attitude of society to spread around them a benign and salutary influence, seize the opportunity to advance their own selfish interests; not caring how much they poison and corrupt the public mind, how much vice and misery they scatter about them, how much they defame and scandalize the wise and good, provided their own mean and wicked schemes are promoted. If in the prison of despair there are dungeons deeper and darker than the rest, surely they will be assigned, (next to such as have perpetrated crimes under the garb of religion,) to those whose writings have disguised truth and weakened virtue.

It would be unjust, however, to accuse all unfaithful writers of downright dishonesty, and malignant intention to deceive. There is a sort of general taking for granted that one's own party is right and all others wrong, a shallow overvaluing of whatever belongs to one's self, and an undervaluing of whatever belongs to others, the result of a narrow education and exclusive intercourse with one sort of people and one sort of books, which leads certain writers to magnify all arguments which favor their own opinions and overlook such as make against them, to feel themselves so much in the right and others so much in the wrong, that they even esteem their own errors as more valuable than other people's truth. Accordingly, some will make bold and confident assertions respecting points which they have never examined, and speak with sneering contempt of the opinions of their opponents, totally unconscious all the while of their own entire ignorance, and of the ridiculous figure they make in the eyes of all who have investigated the subjects in question; while others, who study diligently and laboriously, and make no assertion without appealing to the proper authorities, go to their work with the feeling of a man who has a case to make out, which must be made out at all hazards, and their zeal blinds them to the proper object of investigation, which is to seek truth, and not to make it.

Some of my readers may begin to wonder what all this has to do with the subject indicated by the title of the present article. It has this to do with it: Probably no subject in the whole compass of theological discussion has suffered more than this from

ignorant flippancy and prejudiced investigation ; there is none the correct understanding of which requires more hard study or more rigid impartiality. I wish, therefore, to warn the reader beforehand of the dangers to be expected, to put him on his guard against imposition, and make him feel the importance of not deciding hastily, on the information which he receives at second hand. An unprejudiced and discerning reader, though not gifted with learning, if well on his guard, can give, from the tone and manner of the author he is consulting, a shrewd guess at his capacity and honesty. In this case, as well as others, *instinct is a great matter.**

Having said so much by way of introduction, I proceed to exhibit the plan which I intend to pursue in the subsequent investigation. My general purpose is to introduce the early Christians, and let them speak for themselves in their own way, without attempting to accommodate their language to any system or theory whatever. I shall endeavor to give,

I. The apostolic view of the subject, by simple reference to those passages of Scripture, which, in my opinion, clearly relate to it.

II. The opinions of Christians in the ages immediately succeeding, by fair and ample quotations from the acknowledged genuine writings of that period, to the time of the Council of Nice. These quotations will comprise all the important passages pertaining to the subject, which have been preserved from writers of the highest authority. I shall translate them as literally and faithfully as I am able, accompanying them with such remarks only as are necessary to put the reader in full possession of their meaning.

III. A brief account of the Oriental and Græco-Jewish philosophy, the source of so many heresies in the early ages of Christianity, with some remarks on the influence which these philo-

* In the course of the following discussion, I shall have occasion to refer to two treatises on a similar subject, which have appeared in this country ; namely, Letters on the Logos, by Rev. Charles W. Upham of Salem, and an Article in the Christian Examiner, (vols. i. and ii. New Series.) on the Life and Writings of Justin Martyr.

The Letters on the Logos do not indicate any very accurate acquaintance with the subject of which they treat. The references to the original sources of information are almost uniformly made at second hand ; and though the author takes the liberty to censure the Fathers very freely, it is difficult to find proof that he has ever read their writings. As we have said above, "Some will make bold and confident assertions," &c. We shall see before we conclude how much reliance is to be placed on some of the statements in these Letters.

The Article in the Christian Examiner is of a different character. The writer has studied his subject, and studied it thoroughly. He has gone to the original sources of information, and trusted no eyes but his own. His quotations, in general, are faithfully translated, and for the most part, pertinent to the point for which they are introduced. But in every page of the Article you see the movements of a man *who has a case to make out*. He seizes every shadow of evidence in his own favor with the skill of a practised attorney, and often draws inferences, as it appears to me, much broader than his premises will justify.

Such is my candid opinion of the two treatises above alluded to. Whether it be correct or not, the reader will have opportunity to decide in a subsequent part of this discussion.

sophical systems had on the theological speculations of the Orthodox Fathers.

Here I think it necessary to say explicitly, that unless the reader has some acquaintance with the early Fathers, he will be very liable to receive erroneous impressions from the extracts which I shall introduce from their writings. Their education, mental associations, and philosophical opinions were so very different from ours, that unless we are aware of this difference, and keep it constantly in view, we shall unavoidably affix to their language a meaning which they never intended to convey. In order to understand the writings of the Fathers, we should be able to throw ourselves back intellectually into the age in which they lived. To those who have not access to the original sources of information, I would earnestly recommend the attentive perusal of the second and third of Prof. Stuart's Letters to Dr. Miller on Eternal Generation. They give a very fair view of the peculiar modes of thinking and reasoning on theological subjects, prevalent among the Fathers, and are distinguished by that spirit of patient investigation and conscientious regard to truth, which has contributed, more than anything else, to give their author the high rank which he now justly holds among theological critics.

The reader must be prepared to find, in the early Fathers, opinions respecting the Divine Being, quite different from some entertained at the present day by the numerous sects into which Christendom is divided. The various philosophical theories afterwards adopted were then in a forming state, and had none of them come to maturity. The Apostles had no such theory. The early Fathers began one, but did not complete it. That they worshipped Christ as God, and believed him to be the Creator of the universe, the evidence is, to my mind, perfectly satisfactory ; but that their views of his peculiar relation to the Father, or their explications in regard to the Trinity, bore any very strong resemblance to theories subsequently entertained, I can find no evidence. Indeed, these were speculations into which the early Fathers had little time or inclination to enter. So far as I have had opportunity to examine, it appears that sincere Christians in the humblest walks of life,

“ Who know, and know no more, their Bible true,”

who have no theory on the subject, and have never attempted to form one, generally come much nearer to the views of Christ which were entertained in the first ages of Christianity, than the systematic theologians who have attempted to ascertain the nature of the distinction which subsists between the persons of the Godhead, and to state the doctrine of the Trinity in such a manner as to free it from philosophical difficulties.

I will here insert an extract from the Church History, recently published by Professor Neander of the University of Berlin ; both

for the sake of supporting my own opinions, as far as may be, by the authority of the most learned Ecclesiastical historian of the present age, and of exhibiting the moral bearings under which the doctrine of the Trinity presents itself to one of the most highly cultivated and pious minds now in the Christian Church. The extract, I must acknowledge, I have not been able to translate at all to my own satisfaction ; but notwithstanding the disadvantages under which it appears, I think it will prove, if carefully studied and reflected upon, a better preparation for the discussion that is to follow, than any other which I can give.

“ The peculiar nature of Christianity discloses itself in the acknowledging and worshipping of God, not merely as the Creator, but also as the Redeemer and Sanctifier of the human race,—in the belief that the God who created men pure, has redeemed them when estranged from him by sin, and goes on to sanctify them, till they shall attain in life eternal to an undisturbed and blessed communion with him in perfect holiness. Without this belief and this acknowledgment, there is no living worship of God, no worship of God in spirit and in truth ; for there can be no living worship of God without communion with him, and this, man cannot enjoy while estranged from God by sin, while that which separates him from God is yet unremoved ; and the worship of God in spirit and in truth, can arise only from the soul which has been consecrated to be a temple of God.

“ This view of God as the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of the human race, is the essential groundwork of the Trinity ;—and as the whole substance of Christianity is comprised in this view of the Divine Being, which itself flows out of the depths of a Christian’s own consciousness, it could not happen otherwise than that it should be regarded as the fundamental principle of the Christian system, and that in the first ages of the Church, the essential articles of faith should be inseparably connected with the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

“ Again, this doctrine is nothing more than the doctrine of God, who in Christ reveals and imparts himself to sinful men. It all comes back to the doctrine of the existence of God in Christ ; for the operation of God in the human race, redeemed by him, presupposes the intimate relation into which God entered with mankind through Christ, and the whole economy of salvation is only the continuation and effect of that relation. Accordingly, this doctrine of the Trinity is nothing more than the complete unfolding of the doctrine of Christ, which the apostle Paul mentions as the foundation of the whole Christian system, (1 Cor. iii. 11.) the development of that which Christ himself designates as the essential purport of all his instructions. John xvii. 3.

“ The speculative doctrine of the Trinity, however, ought to be carefully distinguished from this, its real purport, as an essential principle of Christianity ; men may agree in the last, and yet differ in their mode of apprehending the first. The first is formed merely

as a human attempt to bring the existence of God in Christ, and through Christ in those that believe on him, as it is represented in the holy Scriptures, and from them reflects its own image in the inward life and inward vision of believers, into perfect harmony with the unity of the Divine Being. It was detrimental to religion, that in these attempts men did not sufficiently separate the speculative and dialectic element from the essential and practical principle, in consequence of which they transplanted the doctrine from its appropriate practical ground, where it was rooted in the very heart of Christianity, to a foreign speculative soil; which gave occasion to the mingling with it of much that was alien to its nature, and this again led men to give to the whole of Christianity, contrary to its peculiar and natural character, a speculative instead of a practical basis. From this it resulted as a consequence, on the one hand, that men, overvaluing the importance of speculative differences, broke asunder the bond of Christian communion, where, by agreement in the essentially practical, it should have still remained entire; and on the other hand, by striving after uniformity of speculative views, they imposed an unnatural restraint on the free developement of the Christian doctrine.

“It is manifest from the remarks already made, that the developement of the doctrine of the Trinity must take its origin from the speculations respecting the mode in which the divine nature of Christ is related to the Deity of the Father.”

Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, B. i. S. 986.

To a superficial reader, the above remarks may not appear to make any wonderful disclosures; but one who has traced the developement of the Christian system from its introduction, and has observed the different attitudes which it has assumed in different ages to meet the varying exigencies of the times, will see that the author has entered radically into the philosophy of the whole question, and that the idea which lies at the bottom of these remarks, furnishes a clue that may guide one through all the perplexities of the Trinitarian controversy. It may be necessary to add, for the sake of those who are unacquainted with the writings of Neander, that if the above extract, taken by itself, should seem to lean towards Sabellianism, this tendency is only apparent, and arises from the author's carefully avoiding all allusions to the nature of that distinction which he believes to subsist between the Father, Son, and Spirit. The Orthodoxy of Neander's real opinion, on this point, is unimpeachable.

One thing further, and I shall conclude this introductory essay. It was asserted by Priestley, in his *History of Corruptions*, and the assertion has since been often reiterated, that the early Fathers were first led to ascribe divine dignity to Christ, in consequence of the disgrace which attached to their religion in the view of the more cultivated part of the heathen, as the system of an obscure and crucified individual. Thus, by exalting the dignity of their

master, they hoped to secure respect for their religion. But this, it will be seen, is a mere assumption, not only unsupported, but clearly contradicted, by historical evidence. The very earliest of the philosophical opponents of Christianity urged, as one of their strongest arguments, that the new system had nothing to boast of on the ground of the unity of God, since its adherents, in worshipping their leader, were no better than Polytheists; and by deifying a man, admitted the worst of the heathen popular superstitions, which they professed to hold in great abhorrence. And the Christians, in defending themselves, do not deny the charge of worshipping Christ, but affirm that he is a proper object of religious worship, and constantly endeavor, with all the philosophy they can summon to their aid, to reconcile the Deity of Christ with the doctrine of the unity of God. Such is the historical fact, the evidence of which will now be produced.

The earliest of the philosophical opponents of Christianity, of whom we have any knowledge, were Lucian and Celsus; but before proceeding to an examination of their writings, it may be proper to introduce the well known passage in Pliny's letter to Trajan.

At the close of the first century of the Christian era, the younger Pliny was appointed governor of Pontus and Bithynia, the residence of the Christians, to whom Peter addressed his first epistle. (1 Pet. i. 1.) Here the Christians were accused before him, and in his account of their confessions, which he transmitted to the emperor Trajan, he expresses himself as follows: "They affirmed that this was the sum of their fault or error, that they were accustomed, on an appointed day, to assemble before light, and sing together a hymn to Christ as to *God*." (Christum quasi Deo.) Plin. Epist. lib. x. epist. 97.

From the letters of Pliny, it is plain that he was much perplexed in regard to the proper measures to be taken with the adherents of the new religion. He wrote to the emperor for advice, subjected the Christians to the most rigid examination, and even put some of them to the torture, in order to extort from them a full declaration of their principles; and the result of these inquiries was, that *the worship of Christ as God*, was a distinguishing feature of their religion.

Lucian of Samosata, the author of the celebrated dialogues which so successfully ridicule the absurdities of paganism, and are familiar to the school-boy recollections of students, was born A. D. 90, and flourished during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. He was an Epicurean and a free thinker; and no less an enemy to Christianity than to paganism. In his most bitterly sarcastic treatise concerning the death of Peregrinus, (*περὶ τῆς Περσέπετου τελευτῆς*), he has the following passage:

“ At this time he, [Peregrinus] also learned the wonderful wisdom of the Christians, having associated with their priests and doctors about Palestine. And what then ? In a little time he made them seem like boys to him ; a prophet, and leader, and preacher, and every thing else did this one wight become. And he explained some of their books, and expounded, and he himself wrote many, and they esteemed him as a god, and employed him as a lawgiver, and elected him president. At any rate, they still *worship* (σεβουσιν) *that great man*, who was crucified in Palestine, because he brought this new religion into existence.”

The bitterness of the satire is here very apparent. Lucian represents the Christians as so excessively weak and superstitious, that they considered the miserable Peregrinus a god, on account of his skill as a preacher and interpreter of their sacred books ; and intimates that this need not be thought incredible, since they paid divine honors to the founder of their sect, who was crucified in Palestine. He goes on to relate, that Peregrinus was cast into prison on account of his zeal for Christianity, that he was there very affectionately visited by the adherents of the sect, particularly the old maids (γραιύαι) and widows, that the Christians throughout Asia, spared no cost or pains in his behalf, and then, speaking of their devoted attachment to each other, and the losses and dangers they were willing to hazard for the promotion of their cause, he proceeds :

“ For the wretches have persuaded themselves that they shall be entirely immortal and live forever ; wherefore they despise death, and many willingly give themselves up. And since their first lawgiver persuaded them that they were all brethren to each other, after they have once passed over,” i. e. from paganism to Christianity, (πράξαντες ἀπὸ παγανισμοῦ) “ they indeed renounce the Greek gods, but *worship that crucified sophist* of theirs, and live according to his laws.” (Luc. de Mor. Per. cap. 11—14. vol. viii. pp. 278—81, ed. Bipont.)

There is another treatise generally attributed to Lucian, and printed with his works, in which the Christians are ridiculed. It is entitled, *Philopatris*, or the Learner, and is a dialogue, in which a Christian is introduced in conversation with two pagans. The learned are divided in opinion respecting the real author of this piece, some ascribing it to a writer more ancient than Lucian, and others assigning it to a Lucian whom they suppose to have flourished as late as the reign of Julian the Apostate, A. D. 361. I have not the means of deciding the controversy ; and, as the true date of the piece is a matter of some uncertainty, I shall quote but one passage from it. The pagan says, “ By whom shall I swear ?” The Christian replies, apparently in the words of some Christian hymn, as the sentence is in poetic measure, “ By

God, who reigns on high, great, immortal, heavenly, the Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one from three, and from one three ; think these to be Jove, consider him to be God." The pagan contemptuously answers, " You are teaching me to count, and your oath is arithmetic. You do indeed reckon like Nichomachus the Gerasene ; for I do not understand what you say, one three, three one ! Do you speak of the quaternary of Pythagoras, or the octonary, and triad " ? (Luc. Philop. cap. 12. vol. ix. pp. 248-9, ed. Bipont.) It seems that the heathens of ancient times could speak of the Trinity with as little reverence as the rational Christians of our own day.

Celsus was a contemporary of Lucian ; but whether he was the Epicurean friend to whom Lucian dedicated his biography of Alexander of Paphlagonia, or (as Neander is inclined to suppose) a Platonist of the same period, is not ascertained. Celsus was the first professed antagonist of Christianity, and published a treatise against the system, entitled, a True Statement, (*λογος αληθης*.) This work is now lost ; but Origen, who wrote a reply to it about A. D. 210, has preserved the arguments, and in many instances the very words of the original treatise. This reply of Origen's, by the universal consent of critics, is pronounced the best of all his works, and happily it has come down to us in a very perfect state of preservation ; so that we have ample means of ascertaining from it the very first philosophical objections that were offered against Christianity, and we find them just the reverse of what Priestley and others after him have stated. As it is well known and universally acknowledged, that Origen was a Trinitarian, it will not be necessary to give his replies to all the objections of Celsus ; for he, of course, admits that the Christians paid divine honors to Christ, and defends them on the ground that Christ is a proper object of religious worship. It should be observed that Celsus often puts his objections into the mouth of a Jew ; so that whenever the Jew speaks, we hear the words of Celsus.

Lib. i. cap. 28. The Jew says, " He (Jesus,) exercised a trade in Egypt on account of his poverty, and there learned certain arts, on which the Egyptians pride themselves ; and when he returned home, thinking highly of himself on account of these arts, by them he declared himself God."

Cap. 58. The Jew says, " It was affirmed by Jesus, that the Chaldeans, moved at his birth, came to worship him, while yet an infant, as God."

Cap. 66. The Jew says to Jesus, " What need was there that you, when an infant, should be carried to Egypt ? That you might not be slain ? But it was not becoming that God should be afraid of death."

Cap. 69. Celsus says, "The body of God would not have been so produced, [that is, by natural generation,] as thou, O Jesus, wert produced."

Cap. 70. In reference to the food which the Evangelists represent Christ as eating, Celsus says, "The body of God is not nourished by such things;" and on the passage, Luke xxii. 15, he observes, "The body of God uses not such words, nor persuades in this manner."

Lib. ii. cap. 9. The Jew says, "How should we suppose him (Christ) to be God, who, as it was reported, did not perform the other things which he had promised; and when we, having convicted him and condemned him, considered him worthy to be punished, he, concealing himself and running away, was most shamefully taken, and was betrayed by those whom he called disciples? Surely it was not proper that he, being God, should flee, or be led away bound."

Lib. iii. cap. 34. Origen says, "Celsus supposes that we, worshipping (*θεραπεύοντες*) him, [Jesus] taken prisoner and put to death, as Celsus says, do the same thing as the Getæ, who worship Zamolxis, and the Cilicians, who worship Mopsus," &c. Celsus here pretends that Christianity had no advantage over heathenism, because the Christians worshipped a deified man. The same objection is made to evangelical Christianity at the present day.

Cap. 41. Origen says, "Then Celsus reproaches us, and I know not how many times he has done it before, concerning Jesus, that having a mortal body, we suppose him to be God; and imagine that we do a very pious act in this."—"We do indeed suppose and are persuaded, that he is from the beginning, God, and the Son of God," &c.

Cap. 43. Origen writes, "After this, Celsus says concerning us, that we ridicule those who worship Jupiter, because his tomb is shown in Crete; and yet we no less worship one from the tomb, not knowing how and in what respect the Cretans do the same."

Lib. viii. cap. 12. Origen writes, "Perhaps some may think, that, as to what follows, Celsus says something plausible against us in this: 'If they indeed worshipped no other but one God, they might perhaps have a sound argument against others, [pagans;] but now do they worship beyond measure (*υπερβησκανουσι*) this man who so lately appeared, and yet they suppose no vice is committed against God, although his servant is worshipped.' To this let it be replied, that if Celsus had considered this text, *I and the Father are one*," &c. "Wherefore we worship one God, Father and Son, as we have explained; and there remains to us a sound argument against others," &c.

It seems that the subtle pagan had taken hold of the very objection that is now made to evangelical missionaries by liberal Christians, who live at their ease, and scrutinize, in no friendly humor, the actions of those who are laboring to comply with the command of their Saviour, to spread the blessings of his religion through the

world; and Origen gave the same reply that is given at the present day. Truly, 'There is no new thing under the sun.'

Many other passages equally appropriate and decisive I had noted for quotation, but I fear that my remarks have been already too far protracted. This pagan philosopher, who was the first that ever made a philosophical attack on Christianity, used for substance the same arguments that are now urged against the evangelical system. I repeat the assertion, that these are the *first* objections which we know to have been made against Christianity by the heathen philosophers. Such was the shape in which this religion presented itself to them, and such was the mode in which the early Fathers were obliged to meet their assaults. If there are any such objections on record as the assumption of Priestley supposes, of an earlier date, let the passages be quoted, that we may see and believe. Till such evidence is produced, which, so far as I know, never yet has been, (the *assertion* has been often made and repeated, but a single clear, decisive passage in proof of it, from the philosophers or Fathers, I have never seen;) till such evidence is produced, we must be content to judge according to the evidence which we possess.

If the Fathers did invent the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, in order to secure respect for their religion from philosophic pagans, they surely were most unfortunate in their choice of means; for, from the very first, nothing so much excited the contempt of heathen philosophers as this same doctrine. But the primitive Fathers were not thus weak or wicked. They maintained the doctrine of *Christ crucified*, as it had been taught them by the Apostles;—'*Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness; but to them that are saved, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.*' In this would we most earnestly endeavor to imitate their example.

Deo soli gloria, omnia hominum idola pereant.

ARE THE NATURAL AFFECTIONS HOLY?

THE opposers of Evangelical religion seem not to have determined this question so definitively as perhaps they imagine. When told of the entire depravity of the unrenewed heart, they always appeal to the natural affections, as proof that there is something morally good, something *holy* in man by nature. They tell us how tenderly parents love their children, and children their parents; how deeply some persons, who make no pretensions to Evangelical religion, appear to feel for objects in distress, and how

ready they are to afford relief. Feelings of this kind, they insist, are real goodness, *holiness*, and consequently, the natural heart is not entirely depraved, and needs rather to be mended than changed, reformed than renewed, in order to prepare its possessor for heaven.

But these same persons—when hearing of revivals of religion, when told of the ardent love, the deep repentance, the lively faith, the animating hopes, the zeal, the fervor, of new born souls—are wont to exclaim, ‘Of what avail is all this! It is mere sympathy—a mere gush of animal feeling—an excitement of the natural affections—a tumult of the passions! There is no religion, no goodness in it. It will soon subside, and leave the subjects of it no better than they were before.’—Now these gentlemen are welcome to take whichever side of the question before us they please. But they certainly ought to confine themselves to one side. They ought not to be shuffling here and there, to say one thing and the other, just as their inclinations or their exigences demand. We hope they will settle the question among themselves, and with as little delay as possible, whether the natural affections are holy or not, and adopt some theory on the subject by which they are willing to abide.

Evangelical Christians, in general, have no difficulty in regard to this point. They have ascertained to their satisfaction that the natural affections are *not holy*, and consequently, that the possession of such affections by unregenerate men, is no proof that their moral natures are not entirely depraved. And so far as Christian teachers have evidence that affections of this sort mingle with revivals of religion, (and without doubt they often do mingle with them in some degree) they attach no value to these affections, and warn others not to place the least dependence upon them. They make a wide distinction between the mere sympathies of nature and holy love, and insist perpetually, that “without *holiness*, no man can see the Lord”—“without *faith*, it is impossible to please God.”

CONSISTENCY.

REVIEWS.

Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of the REV. MATTHEW HENRY. By J. B. WILLIAMS, ESQ. F. S. A. First American Edition. Boston: Peirce & Williams, Philadelphia: Tower & Hogan. 1830. pp. 348.

THOSE familiar with the Commentary and other valuable writings of Matthew Henry will desire an acquaintance with his life

and character. The means of gratifying so natural a desire are furnished in the volume before us.

Matthew Henry was the second son of the excellent Philip Henry, and was born at Broad Oak, in Flintshire, Oct. 18, 1662. His father was one of the two thousand confessors, who were ejected from their livings, and forbidden "to exercise their high vocation," by the famous act of uniformity. Matthew was born only a few months after this sweeping act was enforced against them. "At a very early period, his mind displayed the vigor and acuteness for which, through life, it was remarkable; and it is credibly stated, that, at the age of three years, he could read in the Bible with distinctness and observation." His early education was systematically religious, and the means used with him were signally blessed. While yet a child, before he was eleven years old, he was brought to a saving knowledge of himself, and of the way of salvation by a Redeemer. The account which he has left of his religious exercises at that period, and of his careful and scriptural examination of his hope in Christ, is highly pleasing and satisfactory. Under date of Dec. 7, 1673, he says,

"I, having been engaged in serious examination—what hope I have, that when I die, and leave this earthly tabernacle, I shall be received into heaven—have found several marks that I *am* a child of God. His ministers say there is true conversion, where there have been covenant transactions between God and the soul. And I found that there have been such between God and my soul, and I hope in truth and righteousness. If I never did this before, I do it now; for I take God in Christ to be mine. I give up myself to be his in the bond of an everlasting covenant never to be forgotten. But hath it been in truth? As far as I know my own heart, I do it in truth and sincerity. I did it December 7, and September 5, and October 13, and many other times. I do it every day.—Where there hath been true repentance for sin; and grief, and shame, and sorrow for it, as to what is past; with all the ingredients of it, as confession, aggravation, self-judging, self-condemning, &c. And I have found this in me, though not in that measure that I could desire. I have been heartily sorry for what is past. I judge myself before the Lord, blushing for shame that I should ever affront him as I have done.—But hath this sorrow been *true*? As far as I know my own heart, it hath been true. 'But I sin often.' I lament and bewail it before the Lord, and I endeavor, by the grace of God, to do so no more.—Where there is true love of God. For to love the Lord our God with all our soul, and with all our strength, is better than whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices. Now, as far as I know my own heart, I love God in sincerity. But is that love indeed sincere? As far as I can judge, it is so: for,

"1. I love the people of God; all the Lord's people shall be my people. And,

"2. I love the word of God. I esteem it above all. I find my heart so inclined. I desire it as the food of my soul. I greatly delight in it, both in reading and hearing of it; and my soul can witness subjection to it in some measure."

Our readers will bear in mind, that these are the words of a child only eleven years old; and that he here refers to what he had experienced some considerable time previous. Let none persuade themselves that they are too young to be converted, to examine their own hearts, and to indulge a well founded hope in the Saviour.

As young Henry had given his heart to God, it was one of the first purposes of his life to serve him in the Gospel of his Son. Being cut off, as a dissenter, from the honors and privileges of the University, his preparatory education was acquired under the direction of his honored father, and by such other private means as the age afforded. With the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages he was quite familiar, having been instructed in them from his childhood. He afterwards acquired a knowledge of the French ; and, as was not uncommon in those times, he added the study of law to that of divinity, before he entered on the work of preaching. He was ordained in London privately, (such were the difficulties of the times) in May, 1687, and in June of the same year, commenced his public ministry at Chester. This city, with the surrounding villages, constituted the scene of nearly all his labors. He continued here until 1712, a period of twenty-five years. At this time, by the pressing importunity of a destitute congregation, and the advice of many friends, he was induced to remove to Hackney, near London. But his course on earth was drawing to a close. Already worn out with long-continued, unremitted studies and labors, he survived his removal but about two years. He died of apoplexy, while on his return from Chester to London, June 22, 1714. His remains were removed to Chester, to rest with those of a deceased wife, and of his former beloved people.

This brief sketch details some of the leading incidents in the life of Henry : The filling up will be found in the volume before us. A memoir of him was published soon after his decease by Mr. Tong, a cotemporary minister, and an intimate friend ; but this, we are told, was not quite satisfactory, either to his family or the public. The memoir before us is very full and complete ; and it is matter of surprise, that, after the lapse of more than a century, so abundant materials remained for its compilation.

Mr. Henry's published works are numerous. Those by which he is chiefly known in this country are, his Commentary, his Discourse on Meekness, and his Communicant's Companion. The Commentary was commenced in Nov. 1704 ; but the author lived to complete it only through the Acts. Dr. Watts, in *his* copy of this work, upon a blank leaf at the beginning of the last volume, wrote the following statement :

" The Reverend Mr. Matthew Henry before his death had made some small preparations for this last volume. The Epistle to the Romans, indeed, was explained so largely by his own hand, that it needed only the labor of epitomizing. Some parts of the other Epistles were done, but very imperfectly, by himself ; and a few other hints had been taken in short-hand from his public and private Expositions on some of the Epistles.

" By these assistances the ministers, whose names are here written, have endeavored to complete this work in the style and method of the author : viz.

" Romans, Mr. [afterwards] Dr. John Evans ; 1 Corinthians, Mr. Simon Browne ; 2 Corinthians, Mr. David Mayo ; Galatians, Mr. Joshua Bayes ;

Ephesians, Mr. Samuel Rosewell ; Philippians and Colossians, Mr. [afterwards Dr.] William Harris ; 1 Thessalonians and 2 Thessalonians, Mr. Daniel Mayo ; 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy, Mr. Benjamin Andrews Atkinson ; Titus and Philemon, Mr. Jeremiah Smith ; Hebrews, Mr. William Tong ; James, Mr. William Wright ; 1 Peter, Mr. Zech. Merrill ; 2 Peter, Mr. Joseph Hill ; 1, 2, and 3 John, Mr. John Reynolds of Shrewsbury ; Jude, Mr. John Billingsley ; Revelation, Mr. William Tong."

Upon all that bears the name of Henry, "the image and superscription of *originality* is fixed, strongly and indelibly ;" so that the last volume of the Commentary will be found very different from those which precede it, and in our estimation much inferior. The style of Henry is thus characterized by his biographer :

"There is, in all his works, an entire absence of garishness and puerility ; they never pander to the odious impertinence of vain and mere curious speculators ; neither are there any meretricious ornaments ; instruction is never made contemptible by empty declamation. No inquisitive theologian, how rigid soever his fancy, need fear discovering in them the mawkish effusions of scholastic pedantry. He may be amused sometimes by colloquialisms approaching to undue familiarity ; by associations bordering upon the ludicrous ; by antitheses, too frequent and too jingling ; and, occasionally perhaps, he may be surprised by typical and allegorical interpretations carried to excess. But he is in no danger of being provoked by silly airs, and self-complacent tones ; and, least of all, being fatigued by monotonous stupidity. All is modest and serious ; intimately connected with the conscience ; and, without the slightest parade, evidential of extensive knowledge, both of books and men ; of accurate and learned research ; and true genius.—It is by no means necessary to maintain that he equals Dr. Owen in profound and continuous thinking ; or Dr. Barrow, in accuracy and elaboration ; or Dr. Bates, in affluent phraseology ; or Jeremy Taylor, and John Howe, in noble daring and seraphic elevation. It is praise sufficient to claim for him the fancy of Quarles, the affection of Flavel, the gentleness of Herbert, the good sense of Tillotson, and the terse sententiousness and antithetical point of Bishop Hall."

The private character of Mr. Henry is represented as irreproachable. As a son, a brother, a husband, a father, a neighbor, a citizen, a friend, he was a shining example to all around him.

"He was, in every sense of the phrase, a domestic man. He rejoiced 'in the wife of his youth ;' and studiously contributed to the happiness of his household. Instead, like many, of going abroad for enjoyment, he sought and found it in his own habitation. Recording a journey to a distance to preach, he says—'In the evening I came to Chester late, and through much rain ; but it was *home*.'"

"His whole conduct to his offspring was marked by kindness. The advice he gave to others, he acted upon himself. 'Do all you can to make your children *love home*.' 'Continual chiding and finding fault,' he abhorred. 'Remember,' he would say, 'that children are *but* children.' If parents would not correct them except in a praying frame, when they can 'lift their hands without wrath,' it would neither provoke God nor them.—He labored to counteract the first risings of evil tempers in his children. He often asked them, and he advised others to do the same—'Whom is it that God resists ?' What is the first of the seven things which the Lord hates ?"†

Mr. Henry was a model of diligence in the improvement of time.

"Value your souls," said he, 'and you *will* value your time. Whatever you do, take heed of idleness. That is the devil's anvil, on which he hammers out many temptations.'—Of sleep, he remarked, that it 'is God's gift to

* James iv. 6.

† Prov. vi. 13.

those he loves ; nature requires it ; grace thanks for it ; but those who love it more than their business, when they should love it only in *order* to their business, expose themselves to a great deal of sin.' 'I desire,' he writes, 'to close the day with—Return to thy rest, O my soul ; to begin the day with—Return to thy work, O my soul ; rest in the arms of God's mercy ; work in the strength of his grace.'

In one year, Mr. Henry "preached two hundred and eleven times, besides his expoundings" and more private exhortations. In some years, he probably did much more than this. He very frequently "preached seven times a week." For about twenty years, he continued a stated lecture to the convicts and other prisoners confined at Chester, until his meeting with them was broken up by the interference of a curate. In his zealous ministrations, the surrounding villages also largely participated. Scarcely a week passed, in which he may not be traced, by his diary, to some place in the vicinity, publishing the Gospel of the kingdom. His success among his own people was such as might have been anticipated, from the zeal and fidelity with which he served them. He saw "the Lord's work *uniformly* prospering in his hands. The congregation became so numerous, as to render necessary the erection of a new and much enlarged" house of worship, in 1699. In a few years after, it became necessary to enlarge upon this. "We know," said the good man, "how to enlarge the straitness of the place. May God, by his grace, enlarge the straitness of our hearts." The number of communicants also "rose to above three hundred and fifty ; unanimity prevailed ;" and Mr. Henry's consolations abounded.

As a specimen of the manner in which he was accustomed to address his congregation, the following may be given. "It is taken from one of his ordinary sermons, and will remind many readers of the impassioned and fervid eloquence of Baxter,* if not of the address and ardor of Paul."

"It is no time to dally and trifle, and speak softly, when precious souls lie at stake, and their eternal condition is so nearly concerned. We cannot *but* speak the things which we have seen and heard. Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men. The blood of your souls would lie at our door, if we should *not* give you warning. What shall I say to startle you ? That I am sure which is weighty enough, though neither new nor unheard of.

"1. That the God with whom we have to do, is a holy, righteous, all-seeing God. That which makes sinners secure is their mistake concerning this. They think of the Almighty as if he were easily imposed upon, altogether such an one as themselves. Thus, they cheat themselves. But be not deceived. Know that God's eye is always upon you. He is acquainted with your secret sins. He hates every sin ; and to all who are impenitent he 'is a consuming fire.' He is too wise to be deceived. He is true to his threatenings.

"2. That you have precious and immortal souls within you, which must shortly appear before God in judgment, to be determined by a righteous doom to an unchangeable condition. You have a jewel in your hand of inestimable value. It is thy *soul*, man, thy precious soul, that is concerned. It is not a trifle, or a thing of nought, but thy *own* soul, which should be dear to thee.

* While young Henry was a student in London, he visited the venerable Baxter, then in prison, and received his counsel and blessing.

Thou hast but one, and once lost, it is irrecoverably lost. The gain of all the world cannot compensate it.

"3. That if you live and die in a graceless, unsanctified state, as sure as God is in heaven, you will be to all eternity in the lowest hell. Though you make never so great a profession; though you attain never so high a reputation among men; though you prophesy in Christ's name; though you excel in gifts; though you abound in usefulness; yet all this, without a living principle of grace in your hearts, will never bring you to heaven.

"4. That there are thousands in hell who, when alive in the world, thought themselves as safe, and in as good a condition, as you do. Multitudes have been deceived with counters for gold—have thought they were rich, when they were not so. There is a generation of such. We have reason, then, to be jealous of a cheat in that in which so many have been cheated before us. This should startle us. Take heed lest, while you sleep as others did, you perish as they did.

"5. That the unsanctified heart may have a great deal of peace, while yet it is the devil's palace; and while he, as a strong man armed, keepeth it.

"6. That while you are asleep in carnal security your damnation slumbereth not. The Judge stands before the door. Death is at hand, perhaps within a few days, a few hours, of you. You have no lease of your lives. The veil of flesh is easily and quickly rent, and then appears the awful scene of eternity: eternity. A criminal who is condemned to die to-morrow, cannot forget it. It fills him, eating, drinking, sleeping. And can we forget the amazing doom, the amazing sight, the amazing gulf, that we are just upon the brink of, just ready to step into?

"7. That as the tree falls, so it lies, and so it must lie, to eternity. As death leaves us, judgement finds us. The doom is irreversible, the sentence irrevocable, the condition on the other side death unchangeable. A great gulf will be fixed. It is too late to repent in the grave. Up and bestir yourselves, for you have only a little inch of time in which to *be* doing."

With all his devotedness and success, Mr. Henry was distinguished for his *humility*. He had a deep sense of the evil of his heart, and of the affecting distance, after all his endeavors, between his attainments and his obligations.

"I have great reason," says he, "to lament my slothfulness, my distractions in prayer, and the coldness of my zeal for God.

"O what reason have I to mourn over my dulness and deadness, and that I am not more affected myself with those things of God with which I desire to affect others. A trifling world, and a trifling heart, are my great grievances.

"I am come to the close of another year; but my works have not been filled up; there are many empty spaces in my time; and in my duties much amiss; little done; little gained for my soul; though much mercy received; yet my talents have not been traded with aright. It is the blood of Christ that must set all straight between me and my God. There I rest my precious soul."

In the character of Henry, true Christian candor and moderation were united with an invincible love of truth.

"He never temporized; nor did he confound things that differ; and still less, did he mistake the tameness of cowardice, or selfishness, or a love of ease, for commanded charity. He knew that that divine virtue can have no legitimate operation apart from, any more than in opposition to, the essential truths of the Bible.

"Noticing the release of the Rev. Thomas Emlyn, (whose popularity was increased by persecution,) from prison, after two years' unjust confinement, Mr. Henry says; 'He was with me to-day, Sept. 1, 1705, and adheres to the Arian heresy. I perceive he not only retains his corrupt opinions, but seems to speak favorably of deism. He tells me there are many deists; and he finds, in conversation, that they triumph in this—that when they meet with such as condemn them, they cannot get them to enter into a fair argument.'

"In reference to certain schemes of miscalled rationality, Mr. Henry shrewdly remarked, that 'pride is the cause of heresy;' and immediately added—'It

was a pleasure to Socinus, that arch-heretic, that he had no master ; we wish it had been his fate to have had no scholars.'

In short, Mr. Henry, in all his relations, was an eminently holy and useful man. He was one of those who, being dead, yet speak, and will continue to speak, with instruction and profit, to generations yet unborn—who, having turned many to righteousness, "will shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever."

Christian Essays : To which is added an Essay on the Influence of a Moral Life on our Judgement in Matters of Faith. By the REV. SAMUEL CHARLES WILKS, A. M. From the second London edition. Boston : Perkins & Marvin. 1829. pp. 348.

THE publication of a volume of Essays, and especially a volume of moral or Christian essays, is getting to be a rarity. No form of composition was once more popular, or more generally sought by the reading world. But within half a century, within the memory indeed of the present generation, a change has taken place in respect to this department, more remarkable than has often occurred in the history of letters. From standing at the very summit of reputation, and drawing into its service the most richly endowed by nature or education, it has suddenly sunk into absolute neglect, if not contempt. We may almost ask, who now reads a Spectator or Rambler, an Adventurer or Idler ? A volume of *religious* Essays is hardly named without producing a positive sensation of languor ; at the introduction of it, we involuntarily "wheel the sofa round," not to listen, but to sleep. As to sermons, a kindred and once equally esteemed department of instruction, and we may almost say of amusement also, they are a drug in the book market ; whole alcoves in our public libraries, (private libraries they now rarely burden) groan with them, unrespired from year to year.

The causes of this change in the public taste are pretty obvious. The multiplication of books has presented opportunity for selection. The variety and amount of talent devoted to composition have vastly increased. The new facilities for printing have brought almost all popular works within the reach of the whole reading community. Of course, that community now consults not merely its ability, or its necessities, but its taste, its fancy. The natural consequence is, that works of an exciting, moving power, beautiful description, animated eloquence, splendid scenery, lofty enterprise, thrilling incident, or the heat and piquancy of controversy, —whatever enchains attention and rouses the sympathies, these, and these almost alone, find encouragement. Reading is more

subservient to amusement than to labor—more a luxury than a means of thought and moral discipline.

The Christian world partake of the prevailing spirit. To be well received, to be read, a Christian author must offer novelty, or imagination, or strong emotion. Truth, in its utmost simplicity, is less satisfying than it once was. The mind is less at home, if the expression may be used; its objects are more out of itself; there is more observation and less reflection; more dependence on external aids, and less on its own resources. There is more information among Christians, but less thorough mental discipline; more knowledge of other men and things, but less knowledge of themselves. The sympathies of the renewed mind take hold of a wider range of objects—such objects fill the whole compass of vision—they give the Christian life an aspect of enterprise, of business, of striking results and rewards; but it is to be doubted, whether there is as true a sense of our real character in God's sight, as humble and meek a piety, as holy and elevated a conception of redemption from indwelling sin, as honorable thoughts of the mercy and patience of the Saviour, as close and scrupulous a walk with God, as have sometimes distinguished the churches.

Christianity should be *practical*; but it should be, also, *meditative*. The monk ran into one extreme; there is danger of running into the other. A man who loves the duties of the closet can easily enter into the feelings of the primitive recluse, who sought retirement from the scenes of human pride, and pleasure, and vice, in the solitudes of nature, where he could bring God near, and commune with Him, without distraction or diversion,

“Prayer all his business, all his pleasure praise.”

How often will a good man wish for such a retreat! How delightful to look back, over all the intervening absurdities, mummeries, and iniquities of the dark ages, to the melancholy but amiable and heavenly spirit, in which, no doubt, the monastic institutions originated. It was the abuse, the extreme indulgence of a disposition deeply implanted in the pious mind, that ultimately introduced the long dark train of solemn evils, which so afflicted the Christian nations of Europe for centuries; and which brought down heavier judgments upon the church, in the form of satire, and sneer, and sophistry, than it had experienced from the sword or the flames of all the imperial persecutions.

In avoiding the extremes of a purely meditative religion, there may be danger of incurring the evils of a religion excessively practical. We know it is easy to predict disastrous consequences, and to deter from every thing great and worthy in its nature by pictures of possible excesses and abuses. They are the lions in the way of duty and Christian enterprise; and it requires no great effort of imagination to see them, in the twilight of futurity, rear-

ing their dreadful fronts, or lurking in ambush, even in the great high-ways of the Christian life. And it is, therefore, not strange, that any intimation of such dangers should awaken suspicion; and seem to some to be pouring water upon the fire of benevolence, which has been kindled at so much expense. We disclaim all intentions of this kind. We desire not to see an enterprise of the churches relinquished; we wish them all God speed; we hope to see them multiplied, and carried on with new vigor, and enlisting every member of the Redeemer's kingdom on the earth.

And if it be true, as we have suggested, that unusual interest is felt in the controversies of the day, it is justified by the bold front and daring strides of error. Let the Davids of our generation go out to meet this Goliath, who is defying the armies of the living God; and let those armies stand by, and look on, and rejoice in the conflict and the triumph.

If the changes in men's tastes and habits of thinking have closed up the old avenues to their minds and hearts; let not such as would labor for their salvation resist the intimations of Providence, but let them search for other ways of conviction and persuasion. If the old language of divinity offends, let them seek out acceptable words; if the ancient forms of composition disgust, let them try others. If men will have biography, and narration, and periodical intelligence; spread out the lives of the saints; show them those of whom the world was not worthy; detail the processes of their conversion and sanctification, their trials, their toils, their failures, their successes, their labors of love and patience of hope. Let in the light of day upon the scenes of the closet; throw open the sanctuary of domestic life—the chamber, “where the good man meets his fate.” Religion has nothing here to conceal; she will commend herself amid these scenes to the conscience and the heart. Piety will be nourished and animated by such disclosures.

Let imagination, also, lend her aid to the attractions of piety; let her create unreal scenes and unearthly characters, so be they offend not against the principles of the Gospel; ideal excellence may be usefully contemplated, and ideal scenes may impress important truths upon the mind. The very circumstance which has created the demand for such works—the increase of a taste for books, and the activity of the press, serve as securities, in a good degree, against the dangerous influence of their representations. Let our periodicals gather up intelligence, and paint the condition and changes of the world. These are among the great motives to duty. All these classes of composition, under the guidance of Christian discretion and pious feeling, may be made of incalculable benefit to the church. Let them, then, be cultivated; let genius task his rarest energies; let labor produce its most finished workmanship; let taste exhibit the delicate

touches of her hand, and clothe the forms of truth with her airy and exquisite graces. But let the friends of a substantial and enduring piety seek to nourish it, all the while, by a more frequent and habitual recourse to the fountains of self-knowledge and self-cultivation. We may be assured, that the gratifications of taste are not piety; that knowledge of religious truth and religious enterprises is not holiness; that excitement, even on the subject of religion, is not necessarily religion itself. If the history of Christianity teaches any thing, it teaches, what the Bible everywhere assures, that the foundations of a stable and valuable Christian character are laid in self-examination; a careful and patient study of our own hearts, our dispositions, besetting sins, weaknesses, all our peculiarities of temper and habit; in deep and habitual meditation of revealed truth. The way to obtain a good hope through grace, and to approve ourselves to conscience and to God is the same in all ages. There is no royal, no new-discovered road to righteousness. We must begin and inquire after the old paths.

It will augur well for the generation to come after us, if a taste for the species of composition, to which the work placed at the head of this article belongs, should be revived. The signs of the times will be cheering, when the Baxters, the Owens, the Howes, the Shaws, the Edwardses of a preceding age shall be again familiarly and freely consulted. There is matter in them for meditation. They are closet books. They nourish the soul. The fruit of their study is that hungering and thirsting after righteousness, which has the promise of being satisfied, and which nothing but *righteousness*—spotless, angelic righteousness, can satisfy.

To the same school, but in a more modern attire, belong Wilberforce, James, Spring, and others. To this class, also, belongs the author of the Essays, which have suggested the foregoing remarks; and we conclude with a very brief notice of the book, without attempting to present, at length, its uncommon claims to the attention of the Christian community.

The work consists of eleven Essays on the following subjects, viz. "True and false repose in death;" "Full assurance of understanding;" "Full assurance of faith;" "Full assurance of hope;" "Christian obedience;" "The form and power of religion;" "Sources of error in opinion;" "False modesty in religion;" "Affection between ministers and their flock;" "Natural and revealed religion;" and, "The influence of a moral life on our judgement in matters of faith."

The thoughts are just and important; the reasoning clear and conclusive; the spirit evangelical; the style extremely neat and often rich; and the entire execution fitted to fix the attention of intelligent and sincere Christians in an uncommon degree. The business of the excellent author, as Editor of the Christian Ob-

server, while so useful to others, is here shown to have been not unprofitable to himself. He has evidently *observed* with a *Christian* eye and a *Christian* spirit.

As specimens of the work, we select the following passages. The first is from the Essay entitled "Full assurance of faith."

"Among the characteristic properties of faith, there is no one more remarkable than that mentioned by St. John, it 'overcometh the world.' It is evident from universal experience, that no other principle can produce this effect. Faith, however, performs it by a mode of operation peculiar to itself; by presenting to the view things that are invisible, and showing their great superiority to the vanities of time and sense.—The reason why men prefer this world to that which is to come, is not that their judgement is convinced, but that their passions are allured. Heaven is allowedly the greater object, but it is distant and invisible: whereas the world is ever at hand with its fascinations. It assumes every shape, addresses itself to every passion, obtrudes into every recess. We are never free from its influence. Whatever we see around us is the world; and if we look into our own hearts, the world and worldliness are triumphant there. The voluptuous man worships it in the shape of pleasure; the covetous, of gold; the ambitious, of honor; the retired, of ease. It dwells in cities; but, not confined to these, it seeks the lonely retreat, it enters the temple of the Almighty, it intrudes into the closet of the most heavenly-minded Christian. Persons the most unlike in every other respect are here equally enslaved. The profligate and the moralist, the infidel and the ostentatious devotee, are under its influence. Business and pleasure, pride and pretended humility, sensual and intellectual enjoyments, all partake more or less of the world. An object thus prepossessing, and thus obtrusive, must of necessity influence our minds, unless something more important be introduced. 'Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' It brings heaven nigh. It antedates eternity. It prevents the unhallowed intrusion of the world by pre-occupying its place, and presenting to the mind objects infinitely more important, and which are overlooked only because they are remote and spiritual. Upon every earthly scene it inscribes, 'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity;' while it invests everything relating to a future world with inconceivable importance. Men in general view heaven as a dream and earth as a reality, and their conduct corresponds to their perceptions; but faith reverses the scene, and thus 'it overcometh the world.'"

The following is the conclusion of the Essay on the "Full assurance of hope."

"It is delightful to behold the advanced spiritual traveller, after the fatigues of his toilsome day, arriving in the evening of life within sight of his eternal home. Elevated, like Moses, upon the heights of Pisgah, far above the busy crowd with whom he has so long associated, he is enabled from the serene eminence on which he stands to behold at once the country he has left, and that to which he is hastening. He looks back upon his chequered path, surprised that obstacles which now appear so trifling, compared with the importance of the objects in view, should so long have retarded his progress. The interposing mountains which once he thought impassable, have now lost their asperities, and appear but as airy clouds in the distant horizon. With sorrow he retraces his frequent deviations from the direct path in search of giddy phantoms, which oftentimes, after all his efforts, eluded his pursuit, or if obtained, proved but an encumbrance to him in his arduous pilgrimage. Animated by the beauty of the country which lies before him, and which is separated from him only by the dark river of death that rolls along its sullen wave to the ocean of eternity, he looks back with regret and wonder upon that infatuation which so often induced him to prefer the trifles of the scene through which he was journeying to the celestial glories of yon blissful shore. 'Forgetting therefore these things which are behind,' he 'reaches forth to those which are before.' His hopes are in heaven. He adopts the language of the Psalmist, 'What wait I for?' 'Surely my hope is in thee, O Lord.' I wait not for any thing mutable or terrestrial. Wealth, and honors, and long life, will not sa-

tiate my desires. God shall be my portion forever. I shall 'be filled with all the fulness of God.'

We invite the attention, especially of our youthful readers, to the Essay on "False modesty in religion." The following extract will give them some idea of its excellence.

"There is no class of persons upon whom the shame of the cross is more likely to produce a powerful effect, than upon the younger members of amiable, but not decidedly religious families. Having, perhaps, been providentially thrown into circumstances in which they have had an opportunity of seeing a standard of religion more elevated and more resembling the apostolic age than the one to which they had hitherto been accustomed, and having perceived the necessity of more than merely nominal Christianity, a 'form of godliness without the power,' 'a name to live while we are dead,' they have determined, by the grace of God, to act up to their conviction—'to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue his faithful soldiers and servants unto their lives' end.' Thus convinced, and thus resolved, they begin their Christian course. The glories of heaven are full in their view. The pomps and vanities of the world have become insipid and even hateful to them. They can enjoy nothing that appears inconsistent with their heavenly vocation and their vows of fidelity to their celestial Lord. Their supreme desire is to be holy as God is holy, and perfect as he is perfect. But too soon 'the fear of man bringeth a snare.' They could, perhaps, have borne the pains of the cross, but they know not how to sustain its reproach. They could brave the open rigors of persecution rather than yield to an unchristian pleasure, or omit a Christian duty; but they know not how to support the tender solicitations or reproaches of mistaken affection, or the raillery, half playful, half severe, of a respected friend. Susceptible and tender, they shrink beneath the cruel charge of unnecessary singularity, if not of hypocritical preciseness; conveyed, perhaps, (to add the more to its poignancy,) by those whom they highly value and revere. They weep while they see friendship and affection, which have hitherto been uniformly exerted for their good, combining themselves with authority which they have always felt it a delightful privilege to obey, in order really, however unintentionally, to pluck them from their Redeemer's hand, and if possible to plunge them into that giddy vortex which their baptismal vows, confirmed and ratified by mature reflection, have taught them to avoid. It is in circumstances like these that the reality of religious professions is brought to the test."

An Historical Sketch of the Convention of the Congregational Ministers in Massachusetts, with an account of its funds, its connexion with the Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society, and its Rules and Regulations. Cambridge: HILLIARD & METCALF, 1821. pp. 32.

IN the early settlement of Massachusetts, the connexion between the church and the government, though not so fully defined or so firmly established as in some countries of Europe, was, nevertheless, effective and intimate. There existed 'a confidential intercourse between the magistrates and the ministers, who mutually gave and received counsel, as the circumstances of the churches or of the community required.' On this account, it was customary,

from the beginning of the settlement, for the ministers of the colony to assemble, at the time and place of the annual election. These were, for the greater part of a century, mere temporary meetings of ministers, without records, or standing officers, or any permanent organization. Sermons, without doubt, were occasionally preached, though no regular provision was made for a service of this kind, during the first ninety years. From the journal of Dr. Sewall, under date of May 26, 1720, we extract the following passage :

"This morning the ministers met at my house. Voted, That a sermon should be preached annually to the ministers on the day following the election. Dr. Increase Mather was chosen to the service for the next year. Rev. Solomon Stoddard was also chosen, in case the Doctor should fail ; and Dr. C. Mather to supply his place, upon supposition that he should be prevented by the providence of God."

In 1721, Dr. Increase Mather preached ; Dr. Cotton Mather in 1722 ; and from that time to 1820, a list of the preachers, with few interruptions, will be found appended to the history before us. In the *Ratio Disciplinæ*, published in 1726, Mather speaks expressly of the ' General Convention ;' of the time of its assembling ; and of the primary objects of the meeting.

" Then the Ministers, choosing a Moderator, do propose matters of public importance, referring to the interest of religion in the churches ; and though they assume no *decisive* power, yet the advice which they give to the people of God has proved of great use unto the country. There is now taken up the custom for (*Concio ad Clerum*) a Sermon to be preached unto the Convention of Ministers, on the day after the Election, by one of their number, chosen to it by their votes, at their meeting in the preceding year. At this Convention, every pastor, that meets with singular difficulties, has opportunity to bring them under consideration. But the question most usually now considered, is of this importance, *What may be further proposed, for the preserving and promoting of true piety in the land ?* Excellent things have been here concerted and concluded for the propagation of religion, and collections produced for that purpose from all the churches. And motions have been hence made unto the General Assembly, for such Acts and Laws as the morals of the people have called for."

According to the present organization of Convention, ' every ordained Congregational Minister, having the care of a particular church within the Commonwealth,' is considered as a member. ' Presidents and professors in the Theological departments in any public seminary' in the State ' may be admitted by special vote ; and no others shall be eligible.' Dismissed ministers, who continue ' to preach as candidates for settlement, may be honorary members, and have the privilege of sitting and deliberating in convention, but not of voting.'

The officers of Convention are a Scribe, Treasurer, Auditor, and a Standing Committee of thirty, (five to ' be chosen centrally, and the remainder in different parts of the State') whose duty it is to ascertain and certify the necessities of those who apply for the charity of Convention. A preacher is chosen at every meeting,

to stand as second preacher for the following year ; and the person who preaches at any meeting is Moderator for that year.

It has been pretended that this Convention is a mere charitable Society ; and when questions of general interest have been proposed, the discussion of them has been resisted, on the ground that they were aside from the objects of Convention. But of this pretence, the history before us is a complete refutation. The objects of Convention are here summed up as follows :

“ From the transactions of the Convention it appears, that its design has been, to promote brotherly love and religious improvement ; to give advice to ministers in difficult cases ; to consider the best means for preserving and promoting piety ; to concert measures for the propagation of religion, and to promote collections for that purpose ; to act in concert, as far as suitable to the ministerial character, in all matters of general concern, respecting the interests of religion, and the order, peace, liberties and prosperity of the Congregational churches ; to hold correspondences with other associated pastors and churches, relative to the interests of the church and of religion ; to aid poor parishes in supporting their ministers ; to assist indigent ministers, their widows and orphan children ; to provide funds for the relief of widows and orphans of ministers, and direct the distribution of this charity ; to bear testimony of prevailing errors in doctrine, discipline, or manners ; to remonstrate to delinquent churches and people concerning neglect to support the gospel ; and to recommend whatever may be of general use to ministers and churches, or to the commonwealth and country.”

The present *charitable* objects of Convention are deeply interesting and important. None can estimate them more highly than we do. But so far from constituting the *sole* object of this body, they form no part of its primary object. The Convention was originally a meeting of ministers for consultation and counsel respecting the doctrines and duties of religion—the general interests of Christ’s kingdom ; destitute indeed of ecclesiastical authority, but authorised to give advice upon any subject that might regularly come before the body. For many years, it had no funds ; and when collections were first taken up, they were applied for the support of ministers in destitute places, and ‘ for the propagation of the Christian religion.’ How far it is *expedient*, in the existing state of Convention, to introduce discussions on religious subjects, may admit of a question ; but whether such discussions are consistent with the primary objects of Convention, there can be no doubt ; since to afford opportunity for such discussions was the leading purpose for which this body was formed.

The fund for the relief of indigent widows and orphans was commenced in 1762. For several years, this fund was committed to the care of trustees, chosen by Convention, ‘ to be by them improved at interest for the use aforesaid.’ For the better securing of this fund and other property bestowed for the same object, an act was passed March 24, 1786, incorporating twenty persons therein named, ten laymen and ten clergymen, ‘ by the name of the Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society,’ to receive and hold such funds as may be committed to them by Convention,

or from other sources ; the avails to be appropriated to the relief of the indigent widows and orphans of Congregational ministers. This society elects its own members, and can never consist of more than thirty, one half to be clergymen, and the other laymen. In May, 1786, the funds of Convention, consisting at that time of £571 1s. 7d., were by vote committed to the Congregational Charitable Society, ' the interest of which, and of such other property as the Convention may put into the hands of such Society, to be distributed from time to time, *agreeably to the advice of the Convention.*' In 1829, the funds of Convention amounted to \$6428,86 ; and those of the Congregational Charitable Society, derived principally from legacies and donations, to \$45,089 92.

In the changes of opinion which have taken place among the Congregationalists of Massachusetts, the members of Convention have of necessity become divided in religious sentiment ; a large majority, however, not less probably (could all the ministers be assembled) than three to one, still adhere to the Evangelical principles of their fathers. But notwithstanding this, owing to the remissness or the liberality of the Orthodox, or to the promptness of Unitarians in bringing forward their friends, most of the standing officers of Convention have been, for the last thirty years, of the liberal party. The following gentlemen have, in succession, held the office of Treasurer : Dr. John Eliot, Dr. Channing, Dr. Lowell, Mr. Parkman, and Mr. Frothingham. Dr. Kirkland was scribe from A. D. 1800 to 1810 ; and Dr. Pierce from 1810 to 1820. A vigorous effort was then made to elect another Unitarian to the office of Scribe ; but it was defeated, and Dr. Codman has since been annually chosen.

From the commencement of the present divisions, until 1827, the preachers have been variously selected, the Unitarians claiming and receiving nearly one half. But as Unitarianism continued to unfold itself, disclosing more of its offensive features, and showing more clearly its repugnance to the Gospel, the majority then felt that it was time for them to pause. As a Unitarian preacher could not be chosen without their concurrence, directly or indirectly—without either their voting for him, or their declining to vote against him ; it became a very serious question whether they should again be accessory, in any sense, to the choice of one to preach to the assembled clergy of Massachusetts, who, they had too much reason to fear, would not preach the Gospel of the New Testament. They could, without violating their consciences, retain Unitarians in some of the other offices of Convention, and they were willing to do so ; but could they consistently appoint, or be instrumental in appointing, a Unitarian to *preach* ? The decision of this question was such as might have been expected ; and from that time to the present, an Orthodox preacher has been annually chosen.

The adoption of this course by the Orthodox members of Convention has given rise to many and grievous complaints.—They have been charged with *illiberality*, and with a flagrant violation of Christian *courtesy*. To this it is sufficient to reply, that *true* Christian liberality and courtesy never require the sacrifice of principle, of conscience. They do not require this of their possessor, nor do they ask or expect it of others. The apostle Paul was liberal and courteous. In things indifferent or unessential, he was entirely accommodating, ‘becoming all things to all men.’ But he says, and repeats, to the Galatians, ‘Though we, or an angel from heaven, *preach any other gospel* unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.’ The apostle John, too, was liberal and courteous. For these and other estimable properties, he was emphatically the *beloved* disciple. But with all his liberality, John was a strenuous advocate for doctrines. ‘If there come any unto you, and bring not *this doctrine*, (the true ‘doctrine of Christ’) receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.’

But it is said, that when the Unitarians were a majority of Convention, they gave the Orthodox a preacher in their turn, and their condescension in this respect ought to be reciprocated. This statement implies that Unitarians had formerly a majority in Convention, and have now lost it. But how does this consist with their pretensions as to the rapid progress of Unitarianism? If their principles are in reality spreading so fast, and they once had a majority of Convention, why have they not kept it? Instead of diminishing, why has it not increased?—The truth is, Unitarians were never a majority of Convention. Doubtless they were nearer a majority fifteen years ago, than they are at present; but they were never a majority, nor any thing near it.* Owing to the occasional absence of the Orthodox members, they may possibly have been a majority at some particular meetings; but we know of no such meeting in which they yielded their rights as a majority, and gave to the Orthodox, when they might have prevented it, the choice of a preacher.

The Orthodox members of Convention are further charged with violating an express *agreement* that there should be an alternation

* “In the early days of the Convention, the exclusive sect was quite a minority of the Convention; yet the liberal party, for the sake of cultivating a spirit of Christian forbearance, united with the minority every other year, in electing a preacher nominated by them.” Christ. Reg. May 31, 1828. Now it ought to be known that this is all fiction. “The early days of the Convention!” The Convention existed, for substance, in the days of John Cotton. It was regularly organized in the days of Cotton Mather. But the Orthodox (here denominated ‘the exclusive sect’) so far from being in those times ‘quite a minority,’ constituted the *entire body*. And from those times to the present, the Orthodox have never been a minority of the Convention. Nor have they, at any period, ‘nominated a preacher every other year;—nor have ‘the liberal party ever united with them in electing a preacher,’ which they, as a body, had previously nominated.

of preachers, each party choosing one in turn.—But when was this alleged agreement formed? and by whom? Let the evidence of its formation be produced, if it can be, that we may see and believe.—The fact is, no such agreement ever came before Convention; none was ever proposed or acted on there. It is evident from the list of preachers for the last thirty years, that though gentlemen on both sides have frequently preached, there has been no regular alternation. We appeal, moreover, to the records of Convention, and to its oldest and most regularly attendant members, to show that no agreement of the kind specified was ever attempted in that body. The only proposition for an agreement on this subject, of which we have any knowledge, or can find any account, is contained in the following resolution, which was offered by Dr. Packard of Shelburne, an Orthodox member, in 1822.

“As in Convention there seems to be something like difference of opinion, which forms two classes, and tends to practical evil, and as each class have not only a right to their own sentiments, but in all respects have equal rights and privileges in this Convention, therefore, *Resolved*, That in future the preacher shall be nominated by each class in turn, and in such manner as that each shall be represented by their preacher *in proportion to its relative number*; and that a committee of ——— be appointed to devise and recommend some equitable method or rule, according to which *the number in each class may be satisfactorily ascertained*, and report to the next Convention, before the preacher be chosen.”

This resolution was referred to the next Convention, when, at the instance of some leading Unitarians, it was indefinitely postponed. They had no wish for a committee to ascertain relative numbers, that they might nominate a preacher a *fair* proportion of the time. They thought it best, they said, that the majority should govern; and because it does govern, why do they complain?—Unitarians are either Congregationalists, or not. If they are Congregationalists, and choose to meet with others in a Congregational Convention, as members of one denomination and of the same body; then why complain, if the majority rules? We do not hear other deliberative bodies complaining on this ground. But if Unitarians are not Congregationalists—if they have departed from the principles of Congregationalism, and choose to be regarded as a different sect; then why retain their connexion with a Congregational Convention? Why not withdraw, and form a body by themselves, and choose a preacher of their own liking? If they prefer to take this course, we presume the Congregationalists will make no objection.

But it is said again, that we are taking bread out of the mouths of widows and orphans. If Unitarians cannot choose half the preachers, they will not contribute to the charitable objects of Convention, and the annual collection will be diminished. This threat has been repeatedly and publicly made,* and last year, for

* “Wise and serious laymen *will cease*, by their presence or their contributions, to give sanction to services, in which such a spirit is exhibited.” *Christ. Reg.* May 23, 1829.

the first time, it was put in execution. Though the assembly was larger than it had ever been on a similar occasion, and the Orthodox no doubt contributed as usual, the collection was materially diminished. The conclusion, therefore, is, that Unitarians in general did not contribute at all.

On this subject, we have several remarks to offer. And in the first place, if the Orthodox members of Convention have committed a fault, in refusing to concur in the choice of a Unitarian preacher, the fault in this case is wholly theirs, and they alone ought to suffer for it. If wrong has been done, the widows and orphans surely are not chargeable with it ; they are clear ; and why should the sins of others be visited upon them ? Why should charitable aid be withheld from them, and their bread be taken from their mouths, in punishment of an offence (if offence it be) to which they have not been in the remotest degree accessary ?

Again ; if the Orthodox members of Convention have committed an offence, they have not done it hastily or maliciously, but after much prayer for light and direction, and in pursuance of their most solemn convictions of duty. Must they, then, violate their consciences, and do what they think would be religiously wrong, as the price of obtaining assistance for the widows and orphans of deceased ministers ? Will true Christian liberality require or expect them to do this ? Sure we are, that the objects of this charity (if widows indeed) would not consent to receive assistance in this way. They would prefer rather to bear their sufferings, or to depend more entirely on their friends or the public, than to receive their bread at the sacrifice of the consciences of their brethren—as the price of supposed treachery to the cause of Christ. And the Orthodox members of Convention, so far as they can be thought under obligations, on any grounds, to provide for the suffering widows of ministers, can better do it in any other way, infinitely better, than by the sacrifice of their consciences. Better give all their goods to feed the poor, and retain a conscience void of offence, than to hold the wealth of Cræsus, and with it a consciousness of having betrayed their Lord and Master.

But we are entirely satisfied that the Orthodox members of Convention, in the measures they have taken, have not committed an offence ; have not even mistaken their duty ; but have pursued the very course, and the only one, which an enlightened conscience and a high sense of moral and religious obligation can possibly justify. Between the Orthodox and Unitarian ministers of this Commonwealth, there is a *radical* difference in point of religious sentiment—a difference which (if truth is of any importance, or if there are any principles essential to the Gospel) does reach to essential principles. If the Orthodox preach the Gospel, Unitarians do not ; or if Unitarians preach it, the Orthodox do not. The truth of this position is palpable and undeniable. These dif-

ferent classes both claim to be members of one and the same Ecclesiastical body, of which the Orthodox are a decided majority ;—if all the members could be collected, a majority, probably, of three to one. A preacher is to be annually chosen to address the members of this body—the assembled clergy of the state, and with them a large and respectable auditory, on the most important of all subjects. In these circumstances, what course does it become the majority to pursue? Shall they choose one, who they believe will preach the truth, instruct and comfort his brethren, make good impressions, and urge his hearers onward in the way to heaven? Or shall they consent to the choice of one, who they believe will teach essential error, make wrong impressions, and the tendency of whose instructions will be to confirm the wandering in their delusions, and lead unthinking souls astray? With the declaration of the Apostle sounding in their ears, ‘If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed’, shall they concur, directly or indirectly, in the choice of one who they believe will ‘preach another Gospel’? Shall they, by any act of theirs, bid such an one God speed, and thus be partakers of his evil deeds? How can they do so? Or how can this be required or expected?

The Orthodox members of Convention have obviously come to the *right* conclusion on this subject—the only one which will bear examination here, or which will endure the light of the judgment day. They have come to it, after long hesitation and forbearance, after much deliberation and prayer; and we trust they will persist in it. If Unitarians are offended, they are offended without reason. Their ground of offence is of such a nature, that nothing but the sacrifice of conscience will remove it—a sacrifice which, of course, cannot be made. They must do as they think best about withholding their contributions in future, and thus punishing the innocent in place of those whom they deem guilty. If such morality is the fruit of their system, it will be worth something to be able to trace their system so directly, in this way, to its practical results.

We hope our Orthodox friends in the city and region will make it a point, in future, more generally to attend the public services of Convention, and contribute, as they are able, to this interesting charity; that if the widows and orphans are left to suffer, it may not be through their fault or neglect.

Natural History of Enthusiasm.

. . . . δύο ἱστῶσι, τὸ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ΦΥΣΙΚΗΣ,
τὸ δ' ἡ ΚΤΡΙΑ.

Boston : Crocker & Brewster : New York : J. Leavitt. 1830.
pp. 302.

If we look about us, we find the principal part of mankind made up of those whose pursuits, thoughts and desires, whose whole moral and intellectual being move round this material world, and are brought to bear upon the circumstances of life, just as if existence here were our only existence, and all our powers were given us for the single purpose of ransacking this physical world, to administer to the comforts and luxuries of our physical nature ; as if man's chief advantage over other animals lay in his being more knowing than they, and better able to make more of the world he lives in.

There is another and a smaller class, who lead a sort of speculative existence, who would etherealize this gross world, and its homely concerns, and all the eternal relations and forms of being which may grow out of these, into something like an universal spirit, of which these are but so many varied presentations. Here the mind may go at large, without any thing to restrain it, or to humble, or pain, or offend. Here man becomes at once whatsoever he chooses to fancy himself ; and he and all around him are in harmony ; for the whole region and all it contains are just what he wills them to be. In imagination, he now lives, and thus he dreams he ever shall live.

The various forms which these two systems take, and the modifications which they undergo, according to the characters of the individuals who adopt them, can hardly be stated here. It may be shown, however, that, though seemingly so opposite, they spring from one principle, and in the course of time have one result. They are equally in contradiction to the constitution of man, and, with the various opinions more or less nearly connected with them, stand no less opposed to direct revelation itself, than to the mode in which that revelation is made in the Bible.

The Bible has regard to man in his twofold character, a creature of body and spirit ; and while it speaks to us of mysteries that both humble us for our ignorance and excite us to know more, it meets us in our common walks, and is a rule and help in our daily concerns. At the same time that it treats of the Infinite Unseen, it takes sensible possession of the heart, and modifies the affections, as well in relation to the persons and affairs of this life, as in connection with the invisible things beyond. It does not compel us to keep our faculties on the stretch, in order to reach and retain our hold on conceptions of God ; for He comes to us ‘ manifest in

the flesh :’—while He is seated far above spiritual principalities and powers, the train of his robes of glory sweep the earth. Nor are we held in a state of abstraction for the affections to grow cold and our apprehensions dim, and then left to return to earth for something at the sight of which our hearts may glow again, and our minds clear and brighten. God has mercifully considered us, not only as we should be, but also as we are. Our spiritual vision being darkened, He draws near to us in his Son, visits our hearts in the Holy Spirit, lifts the eyes of the groveller to Himself, calls in our shapeless imaginations from abroad, and imparts to them form and purpose and practical uses for time and eternity. Christianity does indeed make itself our household god, and domesticates itself with us to give spirituality to our sensible natures, and reality and truth and object to our vague imaginations and misguided reason.

It is remarkable how this principle pervades the whole word of God. The Bible does not simply contain a mixture of certain intimated mysteries, and great spiritual revelations, and plain moral rules of conduct ; but the whole narrative of startling mysteries, blended with common actions, runs on as naturally and unpretendingly as if it were a tale of the mere ordinary occurrences of life.—Thus, the hand, as of a man, is put forth ; Daniel, the inspired of God, reveals what it writes ; the shaped light vanishes, and (goes on the narrative)—‘ In *that* night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans slain ; and Darius, the Median, took the kingdom, *being about threescore and two years old.*’

Thus is the Bible adapted to the two-fold nature of man. We are struck with this most forcibly, when considering man in the different states of society ; that in which the Word of God has never been set before him, and that in which he rejects it, and shuts out its influence. Where, in a state of ignorance and sensuality, he comes nearest to the mere brute, and makes the world but a larger sty, a strong principle within forces itself out through all his fleshliness, and he whom we had coupled with the fed and lazy swine, is found superstitiously peopling infinitude with wild and giant shapes of terror and awe, at the sight of which his own soul trembles. There is an intensity of strength and action in this principle in man, which makes the scoffer’s heart beat quick ; for he feels that there is a meaning in it, and a dreadful meaning. Call it imagination, or what he may, it is not so to be passed by ; there it is, a reality to him he would despise, and to himself too. It may take other forms—as those of beauty, and of a cheering, enticing nature ; it is still the same restless power at work, striving after something beyond the visible and tangible, and by its blind uncertain efforts, warning man that there is something beyond.

What is there beyond ? He cannot rend the veil that sin has hung between himself and heaven. Thus, he sees not the glory

of God, nor does he hear his voice. He grows weary of these gropings after something, he knows not what, and sinks back once more into the senses. But as he cannot rest in these, he makes them minister to his spiritual desires, and forms from them images of wood and stone, and these are his gods before which he bows down, as things in which dwelt life. In these visible bodyings-forth of the perverted cravings of our being, the senses soon in turn become the task-masters, and the higher power within is made to toil for the flesh; and every loose appetite is symbolized, and borne in triumph as a garlanded deity, and the mad route dance and sing before the image that does but give back the shape and pressure of man's own fallen nature.

Here we behold the senses, and that inward principle, gradually wrought into one; the soul, weary of its earthiness, giving form and an image of life to the dull and shapeless clod, and the earthy part of man polluting with its foulness and dust the creations of the soul. Thus man ever has worked, and thus he will again sooner or later work, unless he humbly receive God as he has, in adaptation to man's state, mercifully seen fit to reveal Himself in Jesus Christ. Man cannot annihilate one portion of his nature, and the other live in health. The mystery of God manifest in the flesh is great; but he who denies it because of its mystery, is blind to the mystery and wants of his own being, and denies his own nature no less than the revelation of God.

There are periods in society when the inward principle here spoken of seems to lose its energy and die away; when the whole man is turned towards physical objects, not as in any way representatives of the spiritual, but simply as materials of physical science, and as administering to physical wants and enjoyments. Man, in such periods, ceases to be superstitious, without learning to be religious. Having just enough of the light of knowledge to scatter the shadowy creations of other times, he begins to suspect that all which is not tangible is unreal, and so surrounds himself with material things that the light of revelation is shut out, his spiritual appetences perish for want of use, and he ceases to take pleasure in the exercise of faith. At most, he is possessed but by a wavering, half faith—bearing the name of a Christian, he is a skeptic at heart. In short, he believes in steam, and in his five senses, and these are about all in which he does believe.

This practical materialism, if we may so term it, is, in another way, as fatal to a full spiritual belief, as is theoretical materialism; for it makes man conscious of his power and forgetful of his weakness; while, in relation to another world, if he feels at all, he must feel himself to be only a dependent creature, and about which, to *know any thing*, he must *believe much*. But, treating the material world as its master, he likes not to become a child before the mighty, invisible powers of the spiritual; and he turns

back again to the world of sense, where he has visible proof of his sagacity and strength ; and hope, and imagination, and the complacency of success hurry him along the road of those physical discoveries to which he can see no end. Over this world he feels himself to be the lord, and dreams there are no bounds here to the operations of intellectual powers well applied. Knowledge, not wisdom, becomes his god ; and to be beyond his possible knowledge, and not to be, are with him the same. Man is all in all. Man discovers, and man uses and applies. The detection of the errors of past ages, instead of making him diffident of human intellect, does but raise a feeling of self-gratulation, which is both father and child to high notions of the superiority of his own times. His is not the age of superstition ; and therefore, he argues, it is the age of reason. The Bible, so far as suits this reason, and God, when moulded by this reason, he may admit ; but mysteries past its solving are an insult and an offence. The moral beauty of Christianity may be taken, for a time, to set off a modified deism ; but having no close hold upon the heart, and making but few and weak demands upon his moral nature, it becomes, at last, a mere creature of the intellect, employed to wind up the machinery of the universe, and keep it in steady motion.

As no leading principle operates long in a single class of society, but soon runs into all, we find this same principle at work in the order of imaginative men ; and there, God becomes the soul of man, the beauty and the perfume of the flower, the glory of the sun, and the spirit of the ever-moving sea. He who makes himself a mere creature of the sciences, and brings his whole nature to bear upon the material world alone, and what are called its laws, and he who leaves all these for the invisible, and philosophises upon God and the soul of man, and reasons *upon* revelation, and not *from* it, are both moved by the same main principle, and must both finally come to the same result, however seemingly different the ways they take to it. Whatever apparent difference there may be, both are in fact going on without faith ; both are at war with that principle of dependence which is the law of all that is created ; both striving to act as if self-formed—the one lording it over the material world, as if no God created and sustained it, and the other, in opinion, looking through all spiritual existences and relations, as if no revelation were needed wherewith to behold them. The one, a creature of matter, and the other, a sort of spiritual abstraction, are equally engaged in the vain endeavor to annihilate a portion of their natures. And were it not that Christianity, which meets the wants of the *whole* man, must accomplish the work given it to do, both would move surely, though slowly forward, and those who had refused to receive ‘ God manifest in the flesh,’ would end, the subjects of a gross idolatry, or of an idolatry more fanciful and refined. The man of matter must

needs satisfy longings which will arise in his soul, and must endure his dull substances with life ; while the man of abstraction, to fill his painful void, must have material forms, around which the fleecy drapery of his idealism may be thrown.

Though this may seem to some to be pushing a principle to the extreme, it is none the less sure ; for it is founded in the very nature of the soul thus to act ; and it has always taken this course, and always will, when it leaves its revealed God. When the old world departed from the revelation of God, and worshipped stocks and stones, creeping things, and the lights of heaven, and peopled earth and air with deities, it was not because there were no sciences in the world, and no mighty intellects. Every day is making better known to us, how little there now is in the arts and sciences, and the philosophy of mind, besides what has floated down to us out of the wrecks of former times. ‘ Verily,’ may the man say, who reads the philosophy of this day, ‘ there is nothing new under the sun.’ It is forgetfulness, or ignorance of the intellectual advancement of those times, which has helped so much to the self-complacency of our own age, and begotten that dangerous and presumptuous confidence, that man’s reason is sufficient to itself, and which treats with perfect scorn the thought that the now enlightened man should again wander back into darkness. Yet the history of man is not that of an originally ignorant and savage being. Go back, age beyond age, and call upon him, and each time he will answer thee, ‘ I am fallen ! I am fallen !’ Where he first set his foot, the strong trees root themselves amidst mighty ruins, and from between leaning columns and shattered arches comes a voice of warning—‘ Stand not up in thine own strength, O man, lest thou be brought low ; nor trust alone to the light of thine own reason, lest thick darkness encompass thee.’

What else could be looked for ? What poorer philosophy than that which supposes the imperfect can, of itself, keep in steady advance, till it results in perfection ? Yet thus, virtually, argues the rationalist. And it is the great principle of a popular philosophy, that the created contains an all-sufficient power within itself ; and hence it is that we hear so much more of the light of reason than of the light of the Word, of the power of the soul than of the Holy Spirit ; and for this it is, that when God comes mysteriously near to us in his Son, we reject Him, and put Him afar off. Setting no limits to our own powers, we refuse to contemplate Deity, except in his infinitude ; and stretching forth our finite faculties after the infinite, and searching after the invisible, we become weak and wandering, and are lost. Our God is made an abstraction, and our hearts grow cold, and the heavens void. ‘ I beheld the heavens,’ says the prophet, ‘ and they had no light—and all the birds of the heavens were fled.....and the heavens above be black.’ So cheerless, so empty, so dark and still are the spiritual heavens—

to him who looks up to them through any other than that path of light along which Christ ascended to his glory.

To fill this void in the soul, a religious sentimentality is substituted for heart religion, and a sort of atmospheric divinity breathes around us like a balmy day, and, like a Claude sky and light, wraps heaven and earth in soft, transparent folds. A mawkish love takes place of the wise and just benevolence of God, and our Creator and final Judge is fairly idealized and sentimentalized out of his own creation, providence and rule. Creation, and not the Creator, is the life and the spirit to us, and must needs be so; for the Creator not being presented to us in the Son, nor felt in the heart, through the Spirit, and being without any impersonation for our apprehension, the mind must somewhere have a reflex action, and finds it in the objects of nature. It would exhaust itself by its continual efflux through infinitude after such an abstraction as that to which the rationalist would give the name of God; and so it turns out that nature, however idealized, and however shrouded in metaphysic mist, becomes, at last, man's God, and his only God.

Another effect is, to make man assume to himself something of the character of Creator. Not receiving God as he has presented himself in the Bible, and denying what is called experimental religion, he has nothing to fall back upon, on which to rest as a plain, matter of fact reality. So, the imagination goes busily to work; and, with the help of a little philosophy, sentiment and poetry, and a due mixture of Christian morality, a religious system is made up, perfectly rational—for how can it be otherwise, being the product of his own reason—and the man becomes a pleased and constant worshipper; and well he may, for his God is the issue of his own brain, and from out himself he worships himself. Behold the progeny of human pride—the Creator the creature! the creature the Creator! Yes, enter into the temple of his worship, and see man setting up there the work of his own hands, and bowing before it as his God. The walls of that house do but reflect back his own image; the spirit that fills it is Pride; its Shechinah is Self.

What a result is here! A creature of sin, and knowing nothing, born yesterday, and to die to-morrow, virtually having no God to whom his thoughts and affections can run back; but seeing, feeling, believing—no, here is no place for belief—only what he puts forth from himself. This floats before his mind as his Deity: here are his angels, archangels, principalities and powers: here is the world that he has made unto himself, in the midst of which he sits the crowned sovereign, and which the sceptre of his imagination sways as he may will. But he must die, and must awake again. Awake to what? The creation with which he surrounded himself, angels and powers, are all

vanished ; his very God is gone ; and he is left a poor spirit—infinitude around him, and he alone. Not even the influence of the all-pervading Spirit touches him there ; no light from out the throne visits him there—eternity, eternity, and no God ! There his rejected Saviour and final Judge need not say to him, ‘ Depart from me.’ From the solitary depths of his own soul the words are forever and ever ascending—‘ Without God !’

There are those of whose religion this is the sum, though they cannot bear to be told of it. They have found for themselves a most pleasing substitute for the ‘ things hard to be understood,’ and for doctrines which it requires the teachable disposition of a child to learn, and a renewed heart to obey. They see great moral beauty in the character of the Saviour ; and the contemplation of moral beauty, even without conformity to it, is a pleasurable employment. Most of them profess the belief, and many of them, without reservation, might say, with Nicodemus, ‘ Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God ; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.’ But when Jesus, instead of commending their faith, immediately replies, ‘ Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,’ they do not, in their straits, ask, ‘ How can these things be?’ but say in their hearts, ‘ These things cannot be,’ and straightway leave Him. John says unto them, ‘ Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world !’ ‘ What !’ they reply, ‘ is God Moloch, that He should require innocent blood ?’

It is hard for him who has found this substitute for religion in philosophical chimeras or poetical visions, to give all up, and come and sit humbly at the feet of Jesus. A power which brought the poor maniac there, ‘ clothed, and in his right mind,’ can alone do it. The sensations which he experiences are so pleasing ; the mind is taken up and floated off in its dreamy, discursive course, into regions so magnificent and beautiful ; the man, in his own esteem, is so elevated with the grandeur of that nature which can imagine these things ; and they are withal, as he deems them, so pure, and so intellectual, that they must be truth—and, above all, truth not bestowed, but gained by the great, unaided intellect itself. Such a man, it may be, has his hours of despondency and misgiving, and is sore when the truth of God touches him ; yet he will, perhaps, say to the very last, as, in the course of his life, Jacobi once said, ‘ With your complaints about the unsatisfactory nature of all our speculations I most heartily, though sorrowfully agree. I know, however, no other course than to speculate and philosophise right on.’*

* We must be allowed to refer readers to the article from which this quotation is made. The spirit of it is such, that no one can be offended ; the melancholy story it tells of the downward course of error may be a warning to those who are going the same

Mén of this order, having no certain truth to start from, and to which they may occasionally refer back, to ascertain whether the opinions and systems they have formed can be logically deduced from it, are left without any regulator to their machinery ; and the reasoning faculty acts under a disturbing, irregular power. The imagination, so necessary, in reasoning, for furnishing materials for comparison and illustration, becomes the stronger force ; reason is swept round and round by it as in an eddy, and judgement goes to the bottom. Their minds become loose and discursive ; and though they may sometimes reason acutely enough upon a single point, they fall into contradictions and sophisms when they spread out from it. The character of their minds may be seen in their modes of attack. They make their assaults with rambling rhetoric, which proves nothing ; or bear against a single principle, which they neither rightly represent nor understand, because they do not consider it in its relations. Of God, of whom they boast of having so enlightened and enlarged views, they do not think as a whole. A single attribute is made the object of their contemplation, or rather of their imagination ; and thus his character—even his benevolence—becomes distorted, and its harmony is destroyed. They have no systematic truth, and they can have none, being ignorant of a whole, with its many justly adapted parts. Perverted man cannot of himself find out truth ; and he who is too vain to *receive* it, must live on, the captive of his own delusions.

They not only make a perverted use of their own powers, but are sometimes the occasion of a wrong bent in the minds of those who receive the Bible as full, divine authority. In order to meet the rationalists in their objections, and perhaps, too, from an unobserved fear of not being held quite so enlightened as they, believers become excessively anxious to account for all that is contained in the word of God, to show that everything is upon perfectly rational principles, and adapted to the real nature of things, and that all objections arise from the want of fair, clear and comprehensive views in the objectors. In doing this, they seem, sometimes, to be under great fears for the reputation of the Bible, and to be unconsciously possessed by a misgiving, that, were it not for their intellectual efforts on its behalf, it might turn out at last not quite wise and philosophical enough for advancing reason, and that the ingenuity of man was in a fair way to circumvent the wisdom of God himself.

To be able to refute opposers, and to show the rationality of the scheme of revelation to an age vain of its reason, and consequently skeptical, and not profound, is well ; but there is danger of its unawares forming in the believer's mind a habit of

resorting too much to his own argumentation for the strengthening of his faith, and to find a place of rest for his belief more in that which his own sagacity has enabled him to account for, than in the simple declaration of the Word itself, and for the single reason that it is God's Word. Notwithstanding he holds the Bible of divine authority, he slides into the habit of making his own processes of reasoning the resort of faith, rather than the single fact that God has said it. Now this process of arriving at or confirming faith, is not faith ; and the believer who resorts much to it is in great peril of losing something of the thorough, home conviction of the truth : his belief will not be so entirely a portion, as it were, of his consciousness, the element of his existence—his *belief* is not *faith*, not the faith of which the apostles speak. He too faintly considers that Bible truths are not mere intellectual truths, or to be sought intellectually alone, and that man cannot have a mere intellectual knowledge of them—that, in fact, (let the rationalist sneer if he will,) without experimental religion there can be no true knowledge of the highest and most glorious truths of the Gospel.

This mode of treating upon religious concerns is, also, not without its unfavorable effects upon those to whom it is addressed. They look upon the great Book of God's law rather like judges who are set to put their own constructions upon it, than like criminals whom it condemns ; rather as if they were to see whether it were worthy their obedience, than to find through it a way of pardon for their transgressions. Something like a feeling of intellectual superiority arises in the heart, as if it were a matter of favor for beings such as they to accept it. 'They will think of it ; they will make up their minds about it.'

The apostles did not go thus round about, to persuade men by long argumentation. They took man as he is, a sinner ; with this they went directly to his heart. They compelled him to turn his eyes inward, and look at the prison there ; to behold how dark it was ; to hear the mutterings of wrath ; to see Sin, the jailer there, with his chains, and bars, and instruments of torture ; and then they would open the door of hope, and let in the soft, still light from above, and man would look out through it, and, lo, the revealed glories of heaven, and the dazzling splendors of the cross ! Then man saw and felt the truths of God's word. This was the plain, apostolic way of dealing with man ; and let this wise age learn, that it was and is the only philosophic way. Man must be born again, and must have had a thorough conviction of sin, before he can have seen the harmony and beauty of the great Scripture doctrines, and have learned their adaptation to his own wants and desires.

If unbelief, under its various modifications and names, would be wise *against* what is written, have there not been, from the

first, believers who would be wise *beyond* what is written? From what else proceed the speculations with which Evangelical Christendom has been kept astir for ages? Is there not enough lying within the light of revelation, that men must needs be forever passing out beyond its borders, and holding sharp contest with the shadows hovering in the twilight there? Men deceive themselves in supposing they do all this for truth's sake. It has its origin in an unwillingness to acknowledge practically that there are limits to the intellectual powers, or, at least, in an ignorance or forgetfulness of the fact. When we shall have learned that the only remedy for this lies in a child-like humility of spirit, we shall have discovered that its origin was in pride. Or if we suppose it to arise in part from a fondness for intellectual exercise, it grows to a disease, which spreads from our own minds to other minds, and, what is more, lays upon the Bible the burden of our errors, extravagances and presumption. When we see a scheme set up by one man only to be pulled down by another, and two theories in battle array, both overthrown by a third, and system after system coming up, and passing off, to return with a new name, and pass off again, we cannot but apply to their authors the words spoken of a less harmless race of men, "These ingenious and hard-working people toil incessantly to draw up Truth from her deep well. After unceasing efforts, by many turns of the windlass, and having eagerly watched scores of fathoms of dripping rope, instead of bringing to light a naked goddess, they very carefully land—another bucket of water."

We believe, however, that the Bible is to bring in a sounder philosophy, and juster views of the nature of man than the world has yet known. Not that in certain words and passages there are wonderful influences locked up in a sort of hieroglyphics, of which another Young or Champollion is to discover the alphabet, and lay open the mysteries to the astonished world; nor that what we now humbly bow before as among the hidden things of God, some self-complacent rationalist is to apply his key to, and let in upon them the light of his mind, to show that they meant nothing at all, or nothing but what the reason of man might have suggested of itself. But we believe that the light of revelation is to spread through the mind in a manner it has not hitherto done, and that, as God is now, in an especial manner, sending it abroad over the dark places of the earth, so He is preparing the way to let it shine into that dim, and shadowy, and imaginative philosophy, which has reached us from heathen lands, and to shed warmth and life where a later cold and soulless philosophy has spread its deadly chill.

From one cause or another, it has been a matter of course to shut the doors and windows of certain intellectual departments against the light and heat of revelation, and to light up candles,

and kindle a new fire, before men went about their work. These doors and windows are, however, yet to be thrown open, and into these abodes revelation is yet to shine ; and by its fires, and with its light, the noblest labors of men are yet to be performed. Men are not forever to gather their knowledge and make up their systems of philosophy from anything and everything rather than the Bible, and then to bring that book to their preconceived notions. It is to become the great source whence man's philosophy is to be drawn. When this shall be the case, the moral character and the intellectual will move together in an harmonious advancement. Man will learn, that to be wise in philosophy, he must be wise unto eternal life. The Holy Spirit is to be the great Teacher ; abstract philosophy is to become, as it were, experimental philosophy—in other words, true philosophy will be learned through experimental religion and the Bible. We believe that out of the fall of man, and through his restoration, God is not only carrying on a great moral plan, but is exhibiting a wonderful intellectual process for his study and joy and steadfastness, and that He is about showing more clearly than He has yet done, that receiving his Word in faith, being renewed in his image, living obedient to his law, and being regulated in all our affections by the love of Him, are to lead to a glorious display of the powers of man, and that this intellectual world is to move on with the even energy and splendor of the spheres. System after system has come up and shone, and men have gazed at it, and then it has rolled far off into the darkness, to be wondered at no more. But that which God is about making manifest, to vindicate his own mind, will have His revealed Word for its central light, and planets shall move round it in sweet obedience to its influence, till these heavens shall pass away, and then shall they circle his throne forever and ever, and drink forever of His light.

That which man goes through to be regenerated to God, opens depths in the soul, down which not only had he never looked before, but which till then had been unthought of regions. The stillness which had brooded there is broken ; far, far down, deep is calling unto deep, and the waters of the dead sea move. O, if men would know something of that truly shoreless ocean—the soul, something of those caves which no line has fathomed, and feel the power of the spirit that is moving there, let him see and feel himself a sinner before the Almighty God ! If thou wouldst know the infinite capacity of thy nature, man, feel thyself a worm, and less than a worm, before thy God ! To hear one prate of the light of reason, and the dignity and perfectibility of his nature, who has never felt the searchings of conviction, and the agonizing throes of sin—how gaudy, how poor, how sad it is ! What does such a man know of those depths out of which a re-

deemed one is come, or of the height and grandeur to which he is fast ascending?

This event in the life of man gives him a wonderful knowledge of himself, not only by calling into intense action powers that had slept within him, but by bringing them into action as he and all within him stand related to God, the source of all power, knowledge and wisdom; seeing himself as he is, a dependent being, and not, as he once esteemed himself, sufficient to himself in his own reason, independent and unrelated. But to see one's self in one's true relation is the better part of self-knowledge. More than this, when the world rouses us, and the whole soul is up with the stir of the passions, the mind is looking outward, and fastening upon something there, and takes no observation of what is within. And when it afterwards philosophises about its emotions, it is through the memory, which brings back the past faintly and partially. But when man is conscience-stricken before his God, and would fain turn to Him and live, the whole mind is set inward; and as the working of the soul waxes stronger and stronger, and he sees into himself with a power of vision almost, nay, perhaps, altogether, supernatural—not to philosophise about himself, not even, it may be, with a purpose to know himself—he feels *driven*, as it were, to search himself through and through; so that the passions are working, and the self-examination going on with an almost simultaneous movement; and the man observes and examines his emotions while they are in full life and fervid action.

When man shall form his philosophy, not by wandering to the ends of the earth after his God and to become acquainted with himself, but shall learn that the Life and Light come from God's Spirit, and must be within himself, or cannot be to him at all; the Book which will teach him this, so distinctly requires of him the humility of a child, and so surrounds him with its solemn mysteries, that it will call up with his first thoughts a consciousness of his short-sightedness, and will show him on all sides how closely the limits of his earthly vision press upon him. But to learn early what things cannot be understood, is the surest way to understand aright that which is knowable. To be ever reaching forth after the indefinable, gives exaggerated proportions to the distant, and belittles the near; while to make the distant and undefined nothing more than the present and obvious, exaggerates the near, and robs the distant of its glory. In the one case, imagination seats itself on the throne of reason; and in the other, reason would stretch its rule where even imagination can catch but glimpses. The endeavor to subject to reason what lies beyond its control, obscures its clearness of vision, disturbs its precision of action, and turns it off from truth in its results. The strength which appears sometimes imparted is unnatural energy, followed by a weakness which can be again forced into action only by being forced out of its nat-

ural and just movement. The several powers of the man get into each others' places, and thus objects are seen through false mediums, and come to the mind under changed and false aspects ; so that nothing is perceived as it is in itself, but becomes the embodied presentation of the illusion within. To such an one, the impossible first becomes possible, next probable, and then true, and he ends in believing a lie.

O hateful Error!——

Why dost thou show to the apt thoughts of men
The things that are not ?

There is a beautiful and holy influence in mystery as it comes to us from the Bible, exalting our imagination through our faith. It is not like the mystery evolved from our own minds, as smoke of incense to our pride, but like clouds around God's throne, luminous with the permeating glory from within, suffering us to draw near to that which no man could look upon at full and live, humbling us with the thoughts of what we now are, while it lifts us above the angels with thoughts of what we shall be :—We ascend, and bow, and adore, as we ascend. Yes, he whom the Cross has humbled, may bear to look on its mysterious splendors, and not be proud ; for his heart within him is like a little child's, while the mind is filled with images of surpassing glory, and might, and love.

When the Bible shall have had its foretold influence on society at large, and its vitality shall not be confined to scattered individuals, or to a flock folded here and there, then its principles, as connected with the intellect, will be fully brought out. It will then be settled that the intellectual powers can be justly and thoroughly developed, through the moral, or, more definitely speaking, the religious character alone.—Of its effect upon the physical nature, and the reaction of that upon the spiritual, when all move upon the principle and by the power of God's law, we have not room to speak.—As we are social beings, in proportion as numbers are multiplied unto God, man will find a helper in his brother man, and to be in the world will no longer be, as it now is, little else than a temptation to overcome, but will be an excitement to holy affections, and a strengthener of our hope and faith. The man of piety is not to find all his enjoyment, or all his aid to holiness, in the *direct* contemplation of God and the scheme of redemption, or in dwelling at seasons in solitary pleasure upon nature as the work of God's hands. Multitudes in all classes and occupations, the high as well as the low, and thousands of minds of greatest reach, are to become sons of God on earth and followers of the Cross. Poetry under all its forms, whether of words, color, shape, or sound, is to be dedicated to Him who made us and all things, who gave us its spirit, and set all things in order before it for its use ;

and thus, all our knowledge and all our pursuits are to be of and for God, and we God's.

Then will that glorious display of the powers of man, of which we have spoken, come. It is coming, it is already near, even at the door. Look at the world. The great mass is heaving; for the Spirit of God is putting forth its power. The old temples of error, and those whose cement is not yet hardened, are beginning to sway. A little more, and they will be like Babel. France is giving out rays of the breaking day; in Germany an increasing number of learned and highly intellectual men are arraying themselves under the Cross; and from the laity of England of all professions and ranks, works are continually appearing on the side of Evangelical truth which would be creditable to the most studious and able divines. Of our own country we need say nothing as yet. When the secret or open enemies of God's Word shall have had their brains intoxicated with something better than the neglected dregs which German and English schemers left standing to grow stale in the sun, it will be time enough to speak about the friends of Truth here, and what they are doing and have done.

Of the religious works lately put forth by the laity of England, that before us is one of the most able, and best adapted to oppose the forms in which Error and the Spirit of Unbelief are shewing themselves in this our day. If we were asked what was its characteristic, we would reply, generally enough to be sure, but most emphatically—*Wisdom*. We have kept our readers from it too long, without even the apology that what we have been saying has a direct bearing upon it. But it put us into a somewhat thoughtful humor, and we, as well as others, have our humors in which we like sometimes to indulge.

The Natural History of Enthusiasm—a somewhat quaint title, perhaps—treats, under several heads, upon Enthusiasm, secular and religious,—in Devotion,—in perversions of the doctrine of Divine Influence,—as the source of Heresy,—in Prophetical Interpretation,—in abuses of the doctrine of a Particular Providence,—in Philanthropy,—of Enthusiasm as it appeared in the Ancient Church, and in ancient monachism—and closes with Hints on the probable spread of Christianity, submitted to those who misuse the term, Enthusiasm.

As soon as the reader enters upon this work, he feels that he has passed into a calm, clear, temperate atmosphere, in which every object is beheld in its true size, proportions and colors, and every plant seems healthy and growing. The author's mind evidently rests upon well laid principles of sound doctrine. He has not chosen these to set his building upon, because he was ignorant that there were materials enough and to spare from the demolished temples of other times, wherewith he might have put together his foundation and have raised his superstructure; nor

has he endeavored to ascertain how much of that foundation, of which Christ is the corner-stone, might be taken away, and the house yet stand. He evidently has too much good sense for either of these follies ; too much clear-sightedness to be so deluded himself, along with too much honesty to practise the delusion upon others. The habit of his mind is rather an unusual one for these days. He seems to have reflected much upon God, as he is revealed to us in the Bible, and upon the doctrines of the Bible, and then to have sat down and composed himself to meditate slowly and carefully upon men and their affairs, in connection with the representations, doctrines, requirements and promises of that wonderful book—in short, our author is a thinker, and not a dreamer. How few are there who make the distinction ! and least of all does the dreamer himself make it. He *dreams* that he thinks, and he makes intellectual idlers dream so too, while he is nothing more than a better sort of voluptuary. A thinker ! why he is the hardest worker in all man's heritage.

Our author has the characteristics of a select reader, one who has gathered in his materials, not from a silly love of accumulation, nor from the poor ambition of display, but as matter for reflection. With a mind made to look beyond the times, he considers the coming times in relation to the present, and these, again, in relation to them. He is under the full conviction that God is beginning the broad unfolding of the millennium, and that the work now going on in so much of the world as may, in the strict sense of the word, be called Christian, is a making of the highways straight, exalting the vallies, and bringing low the hills. He has firm faith in still unfulfilled prophecy ; yet, though by no means cold concerning it ; with all its exciting motives, he treats his subject with the same calmness, and freedom from mysticism and schemes, with which he would write upon the history of ancient times. He is the very first man whom you would go to, in straits, for advice. Whether the subject of your doubts were one of intricate and extended relations, or of few and confined ones, whether it had been familiar to him, or had lain out of his track, you would be sure that the result of his meditations upon it would be just. He unites exactness with great comprehensiveness, neither losing sight of the whole in its particulars, nor of particulars in the whole. With the faculty of imagination strong enough to enable him to look up into the highest regions of thought, he has a judgement that will not suffer him to take any illusions there for realities. Yet this man has no sneers for regeneration by the Spirit, nor does he turn his back upon his wounded Saviour and the mysteries of the cross. What a rebuke his calm, comprehensive, obedient mind is to the presumptuous sophistry of inflated men. They seem to stand before his steady judgement like school-boys taken to task.

Some, we trust, will be made better by it, but not all, perhaps not many; for unbelief is all rank with self-complacency, superciliousness and scorn. Look at it! The Liberal scoffs the Orthodox, the avowed Deist the Liberal, and the Atheist makes jest of them all.

With the exception of a parade term now and then, the author's style is plain and manly, and frequently ascends to grandeur. And were it not that we here and there find a word out of place in his figurative passages, we should say that he had kept close to Swift's definition of good writing. As a whole, no book has lately been published in which thought is brought out with so much clearness, closeness and directness. There is no misty medium between the author and his readers. His mind comes directly in contact with theirs.

We have left ourselves room for only a passing remark upon a few extracts. There is but little need, however, of our saying much upon a work which every reading man will read, and which will commend itself to every religious, and, we hope, to every thinking man. It is a book to be meditated upon, not to be run over and forgotten, for each page of it is full of wisdom.

"Enthusiasm," says our author, "is not a term of *measurement*, but of *quality*."—"Where there is no error of imagination, no misjudging of realities, no calculations which reason condemns, there is no enthusiasm, even though the soul may be on fire with the velocity of its movements in pursuit of its chosen object." This will suffice to explain the sense in which the writer uses the term.

We quote the following, not that it is altogether novel, but because it is so clearly expressed, and may serve to awaken a class of intellectual men who are dreaming out a life of sad delusion.

"The religion of the heart may be supplanted by a religion of the imagination, just in the same way that the social affections are often dislodged or corrupted by factitious sensibilities. Every one knows that an artificial excitement of all the kind and tender emotions of our nature may take place through the medium of the imagination. Hence the power of poetry and the drama." "Whenever excitements of any kind are regarded distinctly as a source of luxurious pleasure, then, instead of expanding the bosom with beneficent energy, instead of dispelling the sinister purposes of selfishness, instead of shedding the softness and warmth of generous love through the moral system, they become a freezing centre of solitary and unsocial indulgence; and at length displace every emotion that deserves to be called virtuous. No cloak of selfishness is in fact more impenetrable than that which usually envelopes a pampered imagination."

"A process of perversion and of induration precisely similar may have place also among the religious emotions." "Whoever disaffects the substantial matters of Christianity, and seeks to derive from it merely, or chiefly, the gratifications of excited feeling; whoever combines from its materials a paradise of abstract contemplation, or of poetic imagery, where he may take refuge from the annoyances and the importunate claims of common life;—whoever thus delights himself with dreams, and is insensible to realities, lives in peril of awaking from his illusions when truth comes too late. The religious idealist, perhaps, sincerely believes himself to be eminently devout; and those who witness his

abstraction, his elevation, his enjoyments, may reverence his piety ; meanwhile this fictitious happiness creeps as a lethargy through the moral system, and is rendering him continually less and less susceptible of those emotions in which true religion consists."

In a period of society when prayer is so much neglected, when even females, bearing the name of Christian, are tainted with an unbelieving sophistry as to its need, the following extracts may not be inappropriate.

"To err in modes of prayer may be reprehensible ; but not to pray, is mad. And when those whose temper is abhorrent to religious services animadvert sarcastically upon the follies, real or supposed, of religionists, there is a sad inconsistency in such criticisms, like that which is seen when the insane make ghastly mirth of the manners or personal defects of their friends and keepers. The very idea of addressing *petitions* to Him who "worketh all things" according to the counsel of His own eternal and unalterable will, and the enjoined practice of clothing sentiments of piety in articulate forms of language, though those sentiments, before they are invested in words, are perfectly known to the Searcher of hearts, imply that, in the terms and the mode of intercourse between God and man, no attempt is made to lift the latter above his sphere of limited notions and imperfect knowledge. The terms of devotional communion rest even on a much lower ground than that which man, by efforts of reason and imagination, might attain to. Prayer, in its very conditions, supposes, not only a condescension of the Divine nature to meet the human, but a humbling of the human nature to a lower range than it might easily reach. The region of abstract conceptions—of lofty reasonings—of magnificent images, has an atmosphere too subtle to support the health of true piety ; and in order that the warmth and vigor of life may be maintained in the heart, the common level of the natural affections is chosen as the scene of intercourse between heaven and earth."

"Every ambitious attempt to break through the humbling conditions on which man may hold communion with God, must then fail of success ; since the Supreme has fixed the scene of worship and converse, not in the skies, but on earth. The Scripture models of devotion, far from encouraging vague and inarticulate contemplations, consist of such utterances of desire, or hope, or love, as seem to suppose the existence of correlative feeling, and of every human sympathy, in Him to whom they are addressed. And though reason and Scripture assure us that He neither needs to be informed of our wants, nor waits to be moved by our supplications, yet will He be approached with the eloquence of importunate desire, and He demands, not only a sincere feeling of indigence and dependence, but an undissembled zeal and diligence in seeking the desired boons by persevering request. He is to be supplicated with arguments, as one who needs to be swayed and moved, to be wrought upon and influenced ; nor is any alternative offered to those who would present themselves at the throne of heavenly grace, or any exception made in favor of superior spirits, whose more elevated notions of the divine perfections may render this accommodated style distasteful. As the Hearer of prayer stoops to listen, so also must the suppliant stoop from the heights of philosophical or meditative abstractions, and either come in genuine simplicity of petition, as a son to a father, or be utterly excluded from the friendship of his Maker."

"The man of imaginative, or of hyper-rational piety, is gone in contemplation where God is not ; or where man shall never meet him : for "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy, and who dwelleth in the high and holy place," when he invites us to his friendship, holds the splendor of his natural perfections in abeyance, and proclaims that "He dwells with the man who is of a humble and contrite spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." Thus does the piety taught in the Scriptures make provision against the vain exaggerations of enthusiasm ; and thus does it give free play to the affections of the heart ; while whatever might stimulate the imagination is enveloped in the thickest covering of obscurity."

The uses of the discipline of Providence in giving a sense of reality and importunity to prayer, is thus well expressed.

"The dispensations of the Divine Providence towards the pious, have the same tendency to confine the devout affections within the circle of terrestrial ideas, and to make religion always an occupant of the homestead of common feelings. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous," and wherefore, but to bring his religious belief and emotions in close contact with the humiliations of animal life, and to necessitate the use of prayer as a real and efficient means of obtaining needful assistance in distress? If vague speculations or delicious illusions have carried the Christian away from the realities of earth, urgent wants or piercing sorrows presently arouse him from his dreams, and oblige him to come back to the importunity of prayer, and to the simplicity of praise. A strange incongruity may seem to present itself, when the sons of God—the heirs of immortality—the destined princes of heaven, are seen implicated in sordid cares, and vexed and oppressed by the perplexities of a moment; but this incongruity is only perceived when the great facts of religion are viewed in the false light of the imagination; for the process of preparation, far from being incompatible with these apparent degradations, requires them; and it is by such means of humiliation that the hope of immortality is bound down in the heart, and prevented from floating in the region of material images."

And now one word to those who *do* pray.

"If the language of humiliation is at all admitted into the enthusiast's devotions, it must be so pointed with extravagance, and so blown out with exaggerations, that it serves much more to tickle the fancy than to affect the heart: it is a burlesque of penitence, very proper to amuse a mind that is destitute of real contrition. That such artificial humiliations do not spring from the sorrow of repentance, is proved by their bringing with them no lowliness of temper. Genuine humility would shake the whole towering structure of this enthusiastic pietism; and, therefore, in the place of Christian humbleness of mind, there are cherished certain ineffable notions of self-annihilation, and self-renunciation, and we know not what other attempts at metaphysical suicide. If you receive the enthusiast's description of himself, he has become, in his own esteem, by continued force of divine contemplation, infinitely less than an atom—a very negative quality—an incalculable fraction of positive entity: meanwhile the whole of his deportment betrays the sensitiveness of a self-importance ample enough for a god."

For those who look with cold contempt upon the strong workings of the soul in view of its state of sin, and who treat *conviction* and *conversion* as little better than slang terms, we quote the following:

"In witnessing, first, the entreaties, and supplications, and tears, of a convicted, condemned, and repentant malefactor, prostrate at the feet of his sovereign; and then, the exuberance of his joy and gratitude in receiving pardon and life, no one would so absurdly misuse language as to call the intensity and fervor of the criminal's feelings enthusiastical; for however strong, or even ungovernable those emotions may be, they are perfectly congruous with the occasion:—they spring from no illusion; but are fully justified by the momentous turn that has taken place in his affairs:—in the past hour he contemplated nothing but the horrors of a violent, and ignominious, and a deserved death; but now life and its delights are before him. It is true that all men in the same circumstances would not undergo the same intensity of emotion; but all, unless obdurate in wickedness, must experience feelings of the same quality. And thus, so long as the real circumstances under which every human being stands in the court of the Supreme Judge are clearly understood, and duly felt, enthusiasm finds no place: all is real; nothing illusory. But when once these unutterably important facts are forgotten or obscured, then, by necessity, every enhancement of religious feeling is a step on the ascent of enthusiasm; and it becomes a matter of very little practical consequence, whether the deluded

pietist is the worshipper of some system of abstract rationalism, or of tawdry images, and rotten relics; though the latter error of the two is, perhaps, preferable, inasmuch as warm-hearted fervor is always better than frozen pride."

We wish that we could find room for the remarks upon the Romish subversion of the doctrine of the mediatorial office of Christ, and the substitution of a kind of worship addressed to the imagination with the most consummate art—this, of course, resulting in Enthusiasm. For our author observes that "when, either by the refinements of rationalism—a gross misnomer—or by superstitious corruptions, the central facts of Christianity are obscured, no middle ground remains between the apathy of formality and the extravagance of enthusiasm." This very naturally brought to our minds a class of men, who, with the name of Christians, stand ready, on all occasions, to make league with any,—be he triple-crowned Pope, or broad-brimmed Elias Hicks—who denies the offices and derogates from the honor and power of our great Mediator and Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

The section on "Enthusiasm the Source of Heresy" should be read over and over. We scarcely know how to select from it; for if we pitch upon one part, we feel as if we were leaving a better behind. There is an awful veracity in the following passage. We look around us as we read it; and we behold it an embodied, living truth. There goes the throng. We could point out one and another in it for a warning; but it would be called invidious. Perhaps, too, this is no longer needed.

"In like manner as the passion for travel impels a man to perambulate the earth, and then makes him sigh to think that he has not other continents to explore, so the constitutional enthusiasm of speculation urges its victim to traverse the entire circuit of opinions; and even then leaves him insatiate of novelty. It is not caprice, much less is it the excessive solicitude of an honest mind, always inquiring for truth, but rather the impetus of a too highly-wrought intellectual activity, which carries the heretic onward and onward, from system to system, blazing as he goes, until there remains no form of flagrant error with which he has not scared the sober world. Then, though reason may have forgotten all consistency, pride has a better memory; and as this passion forbids his return to the centre truths he has so often denounced, and denounced from all points of his various course, nothing remains for him, when the season of exhaustion arrives, but to go off into the dark void of infidelity.

"The sad story has been often realized. In the confirmation of the *heretic by temperament* there is more of intellectual mobility than of strength: a ready perception of analogies gives him both facility and felicity in collecting proofs, or rather illustrations, in support of whatever opinion he adopts. So copious are the materials of conjectural argument which crowd upon him, and so nice is his tact of selection, and so quick his skill of arrangement, that ere dull sobriety has gathered up its weapons, he has reared a most imposing front of defence. Pleased and even surprised with his own work, he now confidently maintains a position which at first he scarcely thought to be seriously defensible. Having convinced himself of the certainty of the new truth, and implicated his vanity in its support, deeper motives stimulate the activity of the reasoning and inventive faculties; and he presently piles demonstration upon demonstration to a most amazing height, until it becomes, in his honest opinion, sheer infatuation to doubt. In this state of mind, of what value are the opinions of teachers and of elders? Of what weight the belief of the

catholic church in all ages? They are nothing to be accounted of;—there seems even a glory and a heroism, as well as a duty, in spurning the fallible authority of man;—modesty, caution, hesitation, are treasons against conscience and heaven!”

We make the following extract without applying it, leaving it to the good sense and just observation of others.

“We have spoken of the enthusiasm of mysticism. But there is also an enthusiasm of simplification. The lowest intellectual temperature, not less than the highest, admits extravagance, and sometimes even admits it more; for warmth and movement are less unnatural in the world of matter or of mind than congelation;—what so grotesque as the coruscations of frost?”

“Driven from the enclosures where the demonstrable sciences hold empire, the enthusiasts of speculation turn off upon ground where there is more scope, more obscurity, more license, and less of the stern and instant magistracy of right reason. Some give themselves to politics, some to political economy, and some to theology; and whatever they severally meet with that is in its nature, or that has become, concrete, complex, or multifariously involved, they seize upon with a hungry avidity. The disease of the brain has settled upon the faculty of analysis;—all things compound must therefore be severed, and not only be severed, but left in disunion. It cannot but happen that in these zealous labors of dissolution, some happy strokes must now and then fall upon errors, which wiser men have either not observed, or have spared: mankind owes therefore a petty debt of gratitude to such eager speculatists, for having removed a few excrescences from ancient systems. But these trivial successes, which are hailed with a din of applause by the vulgar, who delight in witnessing any kind of destruction, and by the splenetic, who believe themselves to gain whatever is torn from others, inspire the heroes of reform with unbounded hopes of effecting universal revolutions; and they actually become inflated to so high a degree of presumption, that, at a time when all the great questions which can occupy the human mind have been thoroughly discussed—and discussed with every advantage of liberty, of learning, and of ability, they are not ashamed to adopt a style of speaking as if they thought themselves morning stars on the verge of the dark ages, destined to usher in the splendors of true philosophy upon a benighted world.

“Or of true religion;—as if the Christian doctrine, in its most essential principles, had become extinct, even in the days of the apostles, and had remained ‘under the bushel’ of superstition, not only during the ages of religious despotism, but long after the chains of that despotism have been broken, and after the human mind, with all the vigor and intensity of renovated intelligence, and renovated piety, has given its utmost force, and its utmost diligence, to the exposition of the canon of faith. Of what sort were this canon, if its meaning on the most important points may, age after age, be utterly misunderstood by ninety-nine learned, honest, and unshackled men, and be perceived only by the one? Yet this is the supposition of simplifiers, who, from mere impulse of a faulty cerebral conformation, must needs disbelieve, because theology would otherwise afford them no intellectual exercise.”

How consolatory to the friends of the Gospel is the view taken below of the unity in which the truth is yet to be held. We feel the more faith in the speedy fulfilment of the prediction from the fact, that the sincere friends of Christ, of all denominations, are coming more and more together on the Lord’s side. The pressure of infidelity from without, under all forms and names, is forcing them to this; and may the unmingled love of Christ and veneration for the Scriptures, constrain them, and bind them together. May they be brought to feel that they are all branches—different branches, to be sure—but all branches of that one vine of which our Saviour is the body and the root. Christ is fast setting up his kingdom, and gathering in his subjects; and those who

refuse to honor Him even as they honor the Father, He is giving up to deny the authority of that Book in which He declares himself to be the way, the truth, and the life ; and before long, it may be, He will take from them even his name.

"The fields of error have been fully reaped and gleaned ; nor shall aught that is new spring up on that field, the whole botany of which is already known and classified. It is only of late that a fair, a competent, and an elaborate discussion of all the principal questions of theology has taken place, and the great result of this discussion waits now to be manifested by some new movement of the human mind. Great and happy revolutions usually stand ready and latent for a time, until accident brings them forward. Such a change and renovation we believe to be at the door of the Christian Church. The ground of controversy has contracted itself daily during the last half century ;—the grotesque and many-colored forms of ancient heresy have disappeared, and the existing differences of opinion, some of which are indeed of vital consequence, all draw round a single controversy, the final decision of which it is hard to believe shall long be deferred ; for the minds of men are pressing towards it with an unusual intentness. This great question relates to the authority of Holy Scripture ; and the professedly Christian world is divided upon it into three parties, comprehending all smaller varieties of opinion.

"The first of these parties—constituted of the Romish Church and its disguised favorers, affirms the subordination of the authority of Scripture to that of the priest : this is a doctrine of slavery and of ignorance, which the mere progress of knowledge and of civil liberty must overthrow, if it be not first exploded by other means. The second party comprises the sceptical sects of the Protestant world, which agree in affirming the subordination of Scripture to the dogmas of natural theology ; in other words, to every man's notion of what religion *ought* to be. These sects, having no barrier between themselves and pure deism, are continually dwindling by desertions to infidelity ; nor will be able to hold their slippery footing on the edge of Christianity a day after a general revival of serious piety has taken place.

"The third party, comprehending the great majority of the Protestant body, bows reverently, and implicitly, and with intelligent conviction, to the absolute authority of the word of God, and knows of nothing in theology that is not affirmed or fairly implied therein. The differences existing within this party, how much soever they may be exaggerated by bigots, will vanish as the mists of the morning under the brightness of the sun, whenever a refreshment of pious feeling descends upon the Church."

We will make one more extract, and then close.

"The great principle of vicarious suffering, which forms the centre of Christianity, spreads itself through the subordinate parts of the system, and is the pervading, if not the invariable law of Christian beneficence.

"The spontaneous sympathies of human nature, when they are vigorous enough to produce the fruits of charity, rest on an expectation of an opposite kind ; for we first seek to dispel the uneasy sensation of pity ; then look for the gratitude of the wretch we have solaced, and for the approbation of spectators ; and then take a sweet after-draught of self-complacency. But the Christian virtue of beneficence takes its stand altogether on another ground ; and its doctrine is, that, whoever would remedy misery must himself suffer ; and that the pains of the vicarious benefactor are generally to bear proportion to the extent or malignity of the evils he labors to remove. So that while the philanthropist who undertakes the cure only of the transient ills of the present life, may encounter no greater amount of toils or discouragements than are amply recompensed by the immediate gratifications of successful benevolence, he who, with a due sense of the greatness of the enterprise, devotes himself to the removal of the moral wretchedness in which human nature is involved, will find that the sad quality of these deeper woes is in a manner reflected back upon himself ; and that to touch the substantial miseries of degenerate man is to come within the infection of infinite sorrow."

We wished to give some passages in connection with the above, for the strengthening of those whom the peculiar state of the times

has called to great endurance of contumely and injustice from high and low ; but we have no room. They have this consolation, that a rest remaineth. And how is strength put into their hearts when they reflect, that though they may have much to bear, and may meet with particular disappointments in their course, the great cause in which they are engaged will move surely and steadily on. God has said that the wrath of man shall praise Him, and that the remainder of wrath He will restrain.

In furnishing these extracts, we have, perhaps, done as well as if we had gone into a particular analysis of the work. There are many books of good reputation, of which the substance might be given within a small compass. But beside the fact that this work treats upon several distinct subjects, an analysis of it would have run us out to a tedious length, so compact is it, and so made up of striking and intimately connected thoughts. There is no loose work in it—one scarcely sees where to drive in a wedge.

It is a consolation to us, that this work is likely to fall into the hands of certain readers who stand much in need of it—we mean numbers in the literary and professional orders, and in a class less literary, yet well informed, who are in various ways associated with them. We have opportunities of knowing that many of these are not quite at ease respecting the opinions of their teachers. They have misgivings that all may not be well, not quite so well, as it would fain be made outwardly to appear. When opinions which they know not how to reconcile with their own old-fashioned, yet half-forgotten notions of faith are somewhat boldly thrown out, they are startled into the question, Is this the Christianity which we used to read of in the Bible? and they are alarmed for the moment, to think how far they have been gradually and unconsciously drawn away from their old belief; and ask themselves, Where must all this end?

Their situation is a critical one ; for they allow themselves to be quieted by some plausible excuse—such as, that the opinion was loosely expressed, or was intended to be understood with such and such qualifications, or that it came from one generally held to be adventurous and indiscreet ; or their attention is called off and directed to some part which is of a more serious character. Thus what with a sprinkling of Scripture phrases, and a mixture of some truth with much error, they are gradually wonted to a system of unbelief. They begin with doubting ; they next give up, and are finally in danger of ending in the disbelief of almost every thing but that they themselves are very exemplary believers.

If, instead of looking at the subject occasionally and detachedly, they could be brought to examine it in reference to first principles, the operation of these, and their necessary results, they would discover that loose opinions in point of belief no more come of accident, nor spring less from fixed causes, than do those of the most thorough and firm faith. Would they then go a little farther, they

would also find that if the same principles by which this qualified, half belief has been reached, were fairly carried through, they would infallibly bear men far out of the bounds of Christianity and the Bible.

When men are far gone in unbelief, this effort is hardly to be expected of them. Many a man who is finally lost in infidelity, might, by the grace of God, have been brought back to stand firm in the faith, could he, upon doubting one doctrine of the Gospel, have been prevailed upon at once to examine the principle upon which he called it in question, in reference to every other doctrine. Then he would immediately have seen the justice of the wise and learned Good's remark—'that there was no intermediate ground upon which a sound reasoner could make a fair stand, between that of pure deism and that of moderate orthodoxy, as held by the evangelical classes both of churchmen and dissenters.' The fearful truth would have come upon him whole, and before the mind had formed the ruinous habit of half closing its vision, or of turning away from necessary conclusions.

There is much, however, to hope for from the men of the classes we are speaking of ; for here and there may be seen one and another coming out of the by-paths of error into the open paths of truth. They may have to forego expectations of distinction and power ; they may have hard things to encounter—coldness on the part of old acquaintances—sneers, which have a sting often out of proportion to the size of the insect, and, with these, and harder than these, they may have to endure false surmises as to their motives, cast on them by their friends, too, and made to stick the closer, by an adhesive varnish of smooth extenuation laid on in feigned charity and love. But all these things are easily borne after a time. And who would not bear them for the sake of that strengthening conviction of the sincerity of one's faith and love, which the endurance of evil for the truth's sake always gives a man ?

Sacrifices such as these will be met more generally and quickly than they have ever yet been ; for motives to this are pressing—more and more. The hues of truth and of error are fast separating ; the doubtful twilight breaking ; truth brightening, and error darkening. Soon there will not be a spot for the hesitating man to stand upon, nor a shred left out of which the timid man shall weave *his* cloak of charity to hide his own selfishness, while he is bringing odium on the open, hardy soldiers of the Faith. The two sides will soon be marked off plainly enough ; the distance between them will become wider and wider—too wide for the voice of parley with error to be heard across it ; the way of faith will be made more and more plain, and the sin of unbelief be stript bare of all excuse. The great question, as our author says, is speedily to be, Have we a revelation from God ? And as each man decides this

for himself, so will he reject the word for once and all, or honor the Son even as he honors the Father.

May God grant us the spirit of self-sacrifice in this his cause ; teach us to contend earnestly yet meekly for the truth, and pardon our infirmities when we forget his teachings.

We thank the publishers for giving us this valuable work in so convenient a form ; and we shall feel our obligations increased, if the second edition—which must soon be called for—should be free from the occasional inaccuracies which we have met with in this.

We would say, in closing, that the Natural History of Enthusiasm is a work which every educated, religious man should, if possible, possess, and which every literary man should be loath to confess he had not read.

MISCELLANEOUS.

PRESENT STATE OF UNITARIANISM IN ENGLAND.

WE extract the following from the (London) Christian Observer for November 1829. It exhibits the confessions of Unitarians themselves as to the low and declining state of their affairs in the mother country. Unitarians in America are frequently boasting of the strength of their cause in England ; and Unitarians in England of the splendid triumphs which the truth (as they hold it) is achieving in America. We can assure our Unitarian friends in England that the ' Spirit of Unitarianism ' is the same here as there. '*Cælum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.*'

"The last Number of the Monthly Repository, the official organ of the Unitarian body in this country, gives a most hopeless account of the state of their cause. The running title of the article is, 'Unitarians rich, yet inefficient ;' and the statements in the text correspond to the title ; for it is confessed that "the Unitarian Missionary Association during the last year is an almost total failure ;" that "the spirit of Unitarianism is not a missionary spirit ;" that of their chapels "the tale is brief and mournful ;"* that their assemblies for public worship are ill attended ; that they can, with difficulty, support a single periodical publication ; that their institutions for religious purposes are "few and languishing ;" that, "although for their numbers, the Unitarians are the richest body of religionists in

* "Many of the old chapels amongst us," says the writer in the Repository. "are in a pitiable state. Of our own knowledge, we can speak of some scores, that scarcely shew signs of life. The number of hearers in them will not average more than thirty ; the salary of the minister not more than £ 70 per annum." "One half of the insignificant stipends paid to ministers proceeds from the charity of preceding ages"—(i. e. from the endowments of the old Orthodox Presbyterians, of which the Unitarians have obtained possession.) "In many instances," "the utmost that is done by voluntary contributions, is the raising enough to defray the expenses of opening and cleaning the chapel." The writer expresses the belief that when a few sexagenarians have been conducted in decency to the grave, the doors of these chapels will be closed. "If this is not," says he, "the probable end of no few of the old Presbyterian chapels, we have yet to learn what other fate they can in all human probability undergo." Thus testified a learned, well informed English Unitarian in November, 1829.

the kingdom, they contribute the least to religious objects ;" and, most painful of all, that in India itself, where they looked for most, they are without a missionary, and unable to keep up a single chapel. To say that, with our views of the Unitarian system, we quote these statements with pain, would be an untruth which no Unitarian would wish us to proffer ; but we by no means bring them forward in an invidious spirit. The humbling confessions uttered by persons who wish well to a cause, with a view to stir up their brethren to promote it, are not a subject for insult, and we are far from urging them as such. But we would candidly press upon the announcers of these facts, their own dilemma, that Christianity is essentially " a proselyting religion ;" so that if the tenets of Unitarianism (so called, for we by no means admit the fairness of this exclusive assumption of the term, tri-une not being trine) are not of a character to proselyte the world, they are confessed to be false. The writers escape from this suicidal conclusion by urging that their doctrines are fit for missionary purposes ; but that the holders of them are not diligent stewards in dispensing them. But this comes to nearly the same thing ; since it admits the spiritual inefficiency of the system, even as regards its converts."

REVIEW OF DR. CHANNING ON ASSOCIATIONS.

We find the Review of Dr. Channing on Associations, contained in our number for March, referred to and quoted with much approbation, in different and distant parts of the United States. We mention this as evidence of the interest which is felt in behalf of the benevolent operations of the day, and especially on the subject of the Sabbath. The time has not yet come in this land—God grant it never may—for the observance of the Sabbath to rest on the recommendation of a man, rather than on the law of God.

The Works of President Edwards, with a Memoir of his Life, in ten volumes. New-York : S. Converse. 1829.

We congratulate the religious public on the appearance of this enlarged, complete, and long expected edition of the works of President Edwards. The memoir of his life, with which the first volume (766 8vo. pages) is filled, will be found exceedingly interesting. It details a great variety of incidents relating to the life of Edwards—the different branches of his family, his early history, the character of his mind, his trials and vicissitudes, his religious exercises, his studies, labors and writings, his correspondence, and the circumstances of his closing scene—with which readers, in general, were entirely unacquainted. Indeed, we have no hesitation in affirming, that the Life of President Edwards has never before been presented to the public.—The tenth volume contains the Memoirs of Brainerd, the same that was published, a few years since, in a volume by itself. The eight intervening volumes include what may be termed more appropriately the *works* of Edwards—some parts of which have never before been published.—We feel a pleasure in inviting the attention of our readers to this great and truly valuable work.

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

JUNE, 1830.

NO. 6.

COMMUNICATIONS.

WAS SIR ISAAC NEWTON A UNITARIAN?

It has been the boast of Unitarians that they place no reliance upon names; and yet no people are more fond of referring to the names of distinguished individuals, and endeavoring to sustain themselves on the ground of authority. How long and often did they lay claim to Watts? Yet it has been shown conclusively that Watts died, as he lived, a firm believer in the supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ.* Sir Isaac Newton, too, has been claimed by them with a frequency and confidence which have seemed to set inquiry and discussion at defiance. But it may well admit of a question, whether Sir Isaac Newton was a Unitarian.—In considering this question, I shall first present the evidence on which it has been pretended that he was a Unitarian; and, secondly, the evidence to prove the contrary.

The evidence to be first exhibited is as follows.

1. Sir Isaac Newton rejected the disputed passages in 1 John v. 7. and 1 Tim. iii. 16. and wrote letters to show that they ought not to be classed with the Apostolical writings.—And so have other Trinitarians rejected these passages, and on the same grounds. The subject is introduced and treated by Newton, not as having any relation to the faith and discipline of the church, but solely as a question of criticism. Addressing his correspondent, he says, “I am confident I shall not offend you, by telling you my mind plainly; especially, since it is *no article of faith*, no point of discipline, nothing but a *criticism concerning a text of Scripture*, which I am going to write about.”† Through the whole discussion, Newton writes just as Griesbach, or any other Trinitarian would have written, who had adopted the same views

* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. ii. p. 334.

† History of two texts of Scripture, in Works of Newton, vol. v. p. 496.

on a mere question of criticism. He drops no expression in opposition to the Trinity, and no evidence is furnished by the letters (which were published from his manuscripts after his decease) that he was not sincerely a Trinitarian.

2. Whiston, who was well acquainted with Newton, especially in the early part of life, repeatedly speaks of him as an Arian. He informs us, that Newton considered the two witnesses in the Revelation as representing the Arians and the Baptists.* The former part of this testimony I shall consider in another place, and shall show from the manner in which Newton treated it, as well as by quotations from his works, that it could not have been true. In respect to the latter part, it is sufficient to observe, that we have the means of judging as well as Whiston. We have Newton's "Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation," and find, on examination, no such interpretation as is here alleged. "When the primitive church catholic, represented by the woman in heaven, apostatized and became divided into two corrupt churches, represented by the whore of Babylon and the two-horned beast, the hundred and forty-four thousand who were sealed out of all the twelve tribes, *became the two witnesses*, in opposition to those two false churches; and the name of two witnesses, once imposed, remains to the true church of God, in all times and places, to the end of the prophecy."†—This does not look as though, in the judgement of Newton, the two witnesses represented the Arians and Baptists; nor is it at all consistent with so childish an interpretation.

3. It has been said, that it was at the suggestion of Sir Isaac Newton that Dr. Clarke was led to adopt his peculiar views of the person of Christ, and to publish what he called "the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity." Thus the Chevalier Ramsay informs us, that "Sir Isaac Newton, being carried away with a fondness to refine upon the ancient heresies of the East, revived Arianism by the pen of his famous disciple and interpreter, Dr. Clarke." The same writer adds, that Dr. Clarke renounced his errors, and deeply regretted what he had done, before his death.‡ But this whole account, it is believed, is without foundation. Dr. Kippis, himself an Arian, declares it "to be an absolute falsehood."§ Whiston, in his *Memoirs of Clarke*, informs us at what time he (Clarke) began to hesitate respecting the Trinity, and expresses the opinion, that his doubts were the result of his own inquiries. p. 8. Mr. Lindsey also rejects the idea, that Newton had an undue influence in forming the opinions of Dr. Clarke, or that he persuaded him to publish on the subject of the Trinity.¶ Indeed,

* *Memoirs of Whiston*, pp. 206, 477. Whiston also represented Sir Isaac Newton as a Universalist. See *Historical Memoirs of Dr. Clarke*, p. 75.

† *Works*, vol. v. pp. 486, 469.

‡ *Biographia Britannica*, vol. iii. p. 606.

§ *Preface to Historical View, &c.* p. 14.

the account here examined has been rejected and resented, especially by the friends of Dr. Clarke, as calculated to stain his reputation and do injustice to his memory.*

4. It has been asserted, on the authority of Hopton Haynes, Esq., an officer of the mint at the time when Newton was master, that he was a Socinian. The testimony of Mr. Haynes is as follows: "Sir Isaac Newton did not believe our Lord's pre-existence, being a Socinian, as we call it, in that article." He "much lamented Dr. Clarke's embracing Arianism, which opinion he feared had been, and still would be, if maintained by learned men, a great obstruction to the progress of Christianity." "The time," he said, "will come, when the doctrine of the incarnation, as commonly received, shall be exploded as an absurdity, equal to transubstantiation."†

To this account I reply, in the first place, that it is contradicted by all the testimony previously examined. Whiston makes Newton an Arian; but if he was an Arian, he could not have been a Socinian. Indeed Whiston expressly assures us that he was not a Socinian, and tells us of a person who, after conversing with him, was induced to renounce Socinian principles.‡ The Chevalier Ramsay makes Newton the instructor and instigator of Dr. Clarke. But Dr. Clarke, whatever else he may be called, certainly was not a Socinian.

The testimony of Mr. Haynes is further contradicted by Sir Isaac Newton's own writings. Of the truth of this, abundant evidence will be furnished under another head.

The particulars here stated embrace all the evidence which I have been able to collect that Sir Isaac Newton was a Unitarian. Whether it is sufficient to dispel doubt, and to warrant the strong confidence which Unitarians have so often expressed respecting him, my readers will judge.

Let us next attend to the evidence that Newton was a Trinitarian. And,

1. He was, *by profession*, a Trinitarian. He united stately in Trinitarian worship, and was a regular member and communicant of a Trinitarian church. He is represented by some of his biographers as "*ardently attached to the TENETS and discipline of the church of England.*" Is not this strong *prima facie* evidence that he received the *doctrines* of this church? Is it not sufficient, of itself, to establish the point in question, unless counterbalanced by plain and positive proof to the contrary? Newton certainly had sagacity enough to understand the articles of his church; and it is to be presumed he had honesty enough not to *appear* to assent to them, when in truth he did not assent. In

* See Observations on Historical Memoirs of Dr. Clarke, pp. 23, 24.

† In Lindsey's Sequel. p. 18. Mr. Haynes was a zealous Unitarian.

‡ Historical Memoirs of Dr. Clarke, p. 8.

other words, he had honestly enough not to be a hypocrite. How then shall we account for his continuing, through his long life, to worship and commune in a Trinitarian church, and to be, by profession, a Trinitarian, unless he was one in reality? But,

2. Not a sentence can be found in all the writings of Sir Isaac Newton, to show that he was not a believer in the Trinity. This is admitted by Mr. Lindsey. "This most eminent person," says he, "*never openly declared his sentiments* on this most important subject (the Trinity) in his life time, and rather insinuated them indistinctly in his writings, which were published afterwards."* The writings here spoken of, which were published after the death of Newton, are his letters on the two disputed passages. But these letters contain nothing which is not very consistent with the strict orthodoxy of their author. Indeed they have much stronger insinuations, as I shall show, in favor of the Trinity, than any which can be found against it.

3. I have observed already, that Whiston represented Sir Isaac Newton to be an Arian. It should now be added, that by so doing, he forfeited the friendship of Newton, incurred his displeasure, and committed an offence for which he could hardly be forgiven.—In the former part of his life, Newton regarded Whiston with much favor, and recommended him to be his successor in the Professorship of Mathematicks at Cambridge. But in 1720, when Whiston was proposed as a member of the Royal Society, Newton objected, and said, that if Whiston was chosen a member, he would not be President. Whiston attributes this to his "fearful, cautious, suspicious temper," and to his not being able to bear contradiction.† But the truth is, that by charging his former patron with Arianism and Universalism, he was regarded as having justly forfeited his confidence, and shown himself unworthy of his favor, and Newton intended to have as little intercourse with him as possible. "It is a well known fact," say the Eclectic Reviewers, "that he (Newton) was so angry with Whiston for having said he was an Arian, that Whiston was not sure he had thoroughly forgiven him for years after."‡ Now I would ask all those who venerate the name of Newton, whether here is not conclusive proof that he was not an Arian? For if such were his real sentiments; if he had given Whiston reason to know that they were such; and if Whiston had represented the matter fairly and truly; would Sir Isaac Newton have been so angry with him? Would he have retained his resentment for years? Would he have refused to preside in the Royal Society, if Whiston became a member of it? The supposition cannot be admitted. Or if it could be, the reputation of the great philosopher would thereby be ruined.

* Historical View, &c. p. 402.

† Memoirs of Whiston, pp. 293, 294.

‡ Vol. viii. p. 1011.

I would not be understood as charging Whiston with wilful misrepresentation. But those acquainted with his character and history will readily conceive that he might have been mistaken. His prejudices and wishes might have led him to catch at particular expressions, and turn them aside from their intended import. In the troubles through which Whiston passed at the University on account of his Arianism, he had strong temptations to say, 'My predecessor is an Arian,' and thus seek support in the authority of so great a name. But Newton regarded himself as slandered and injured, and all who honor his name and character are bound to believe that this was the case.

4 It remains that I produce several passages from the writings of Newton, which plainly indicate his Trinitarian sentiments.—In his remarks on the disputed passage, 1 John v. 7. he says, "In the Eastern nations, and for a long time in the Western, *the faith* subsisted without this text; and it is rather a danger to religion than an advantage, to make it now lean upon a bruised reed."* "The faith" spoken of in this passage must necessarily include the doctrine of the Trinity; as this is the only article of faith, or doctrine of religion, which has ever been supposed to "lean upon" the disputed passage in John. But Sir Isaac Newton represents this faith as having existed in the primitive church, and as being an article for the safety and defence of which he is concerned.—Again, speaking of the use that was made of the disputed passage in Timothy, during the Nestorian controversy, Newton says, "The two parties ran the interpretation into *extremes*, the one disputing that he who was manifest in the flesh was a *creature*"—this was one extreme—"the other that it was the Word of God." Newton thought that the *ancient* Christians interpreted this passage of Christ, without *restraining* it to his Divinity, or his humanity."* It is obvious that this passage could not have been written by a Socinian, or an Arian. It could not have been written by one who run into the objectionable "extreme" of regarding our blessed Lord as "a creature," or who did not believe in "his Divinity," as well as "his humanity."

The following passage is from the Observations of Sir Isaac Newton on the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation: "And lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of

* Works of Newton, vol. v. pp. 495, 548.

them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.' The beasts and elders," says Newton, "represent the primitive Christians of all nations; and the worship of these Christians, in their churches, is here represented under the form of *worshipping God and the Lamb in the temple*: God, for his benefaction in creating all things; and *the Lamb for his benefaction in redeeming us by his blood*. 'And I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.' This," says Sir Isaac Newton again, "*this was the worship of the primitive Christians*.*—No wonder that an individual who thus regarded the primitive Christians as literally honoring the Son even as they honored the Father, and as rendering precisely the *same* worship to Him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb, should be "ardently attached to the tenets" of a church, in which Christ is worshipped as truly a divine person.

I have now shown, that Newton was by profession and worship a Trinitarian, and that not a sentence can be gathered from his numerous writings to show that he was not a Trinitarian. So far from this, it is evident from passages which have been quoted, that he regarded the Trinity as belonging to the faith of the primitive church; did not hold the Lord Jesus to be "a creature"; spoke familiarly of "his Divinity," and "his humanity"; and represented him as receiving the same Divine worship and honor from the primitive Christians which they rendered to the Father. By some of his cotemporaries he was called an Arian; but we have seen that he thought himself injured by such an imputation, and could hardly forgive the individual who first attempted to fasten it upon him.

Here I might leave the subject, were it not that I feel bound to protest against the practice, so common in some denominations, of claiming, on slight and insufficient grounds, distinguished men as belonging to their number. The great philosopher, whose

* Works of Newton, vol. v. p. 455. How does the sentiment here expressed coincide with the testimony of Mr. Haynes, that Newton denied the pre-existence and incarnation of the Son of God?

name has been so often mentioned, was certainly capable of choosing a religion for himself, and, after long and mature deliberation, he did choose to be considered and known as a member of the (Trinitarian) church of England. He never published a sentence to indicate his rejection of the Trinity, but many sentences which look strongly and decisively in its favor. He refused to be called a Unitarian in his lifetime, and was angry with the individual who presumed thus to speak of him. With what propriety, then, I ask—when he is now dead, and can no longer answer for himself—is he represented continually, on the testimony of interested and prejudiced individuals, as beyond all question a Unitarian? No one can believe him a Unitarian, without believing him a virtual falsifier and hypocrite, and without believing that he treated his friend Whiston in a manner the most ungenerous and unchristian. Why then should not the question of his religious sentiments be suffered to remain, as he chose it should be while he lived, and as he chose to leave it when he left the world?

OPINIONS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS RESPECTING THE
TRINITY.

No. 2.—*The Apostolic Age and the Apostolic Fathers.*

Two things are allowed by all, namely; that *God is one*, and that *the man Christ Jesus is inferior to God the Father*. The urging of those texts, therefore, which assert the unity of God or the humanity of Jesus, as proofs against the faith of Trinitarians, argues nothing but want of knowledge, or want of candor, on the part of those who make use of them for such a purpose. The premises are granted, the conclusion is denied; and he who would convict us of error, must condescend to show us that the arguments he uses do really lead to the result on which he insists.

In exhibiting the information which Jesus and his apostles have left us on this subject, I shall simply refer to a very few of the more plain and decisive texts of the New Testament, which speak of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; leaving it to the reader to examine the passages referred to, and to determine for himself respecting their pertinency as proof-texts. The particular discussion, the arrangement and illustration of these passages, in order to point out their mutual relation, and to show the bearing which they have on each other, belong to the departments of exegesis and theology, and not to that of history, to which I am limited.

Our Saviour, when he took leave of his disciples, commanded them to *Go and teach all nations, baptising them into the name of*

the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : (Matt. xxviii. 19.) thus warning the converts to Christianity, on the very threshold of their profession, to look on Father, Son, and Spirit with veneration and love, as sustaining to each other and to believers a most intimate relation ; a relation altogether essential to the nature of the new religion ;—thus binding them, by the initiatory and most solemn rite of Christianity, to give up themselves, and all that they have and hope for, entirely and without reserve to the direction and disposal of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In other words, the rite of baptism was designed to teach and oblige every convert to Christianity to acknowledge and worship God as the Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier of the human race.

Jesus describes the Father as the God and Father of men, and of himself, (Matt. xi. 27 : xxii. 43 : John xx. 17.) He calls himself the Son of God, and as such claims peculiar honors, enough to show that he is Son in a peculiar sense. In the discourses of Christ, presented by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the term Son of God seems in general to be nearly synonymous with Messiah, the messenger of God to men, and most of the honors which Christ claims correspond to this character ; but John, the special object of whose writings was to assert the divine dignity of his Master, in opposition to the Jewish corruptors of Christianity, has preserved discourses, in which Jesus advances much higher claims. He here describes himself as the only one who had come down from heaven, (John iii. 13 : vi. 38 : compare i. 18.) whither he should again return ; (xvii. 11.) as having existed before the time of Abraham ; (viii. 58.) as having been appointed the Judge of men, that all men might honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. (v. 22, 23.) He also speaks of his power and glory as derived from the Father, (v. 26, 27, 30,) and says expressly, *My Father is greater than I.* (xiv. 28.)

In the Apocalypse, Christ is introduced laying claim to the highest of the divine attributes, such as absolute eternity, creative power, supreme dominion, etc. (Rev. i. 8, 11, 17, compare Isaiah xlv. 6. See also Rev. xxi. 22 : xxii. 1, 3 ; and other texts, compared with the corresponding passages in the Old Testament.)

Jesus speaks of the Holy Ghost as the divine power by which he performed his miracles, (Matt. xii. 28, compare Luke xi. 20.) assigns to the Spirit a rank with the Father and himself, (Matt. xxviii. 19.) and speaks of him as a Divine instructor and Comforter who should supply his place with the disciples, (John xiv. 26 : xv. 26.) Thus our Saviour claims for himself, in his own discourses, some attributes which can belong only to a Divine, and others which can belong only to a human nature ; and he assigns to the Holy Spirit a Divine rank and a separate Divine agency : yet he nowhere explains to us the peculiar mode of his own existence, or the exact relation which he and the Spirit sustain to the Father.

The apostle John, who wrote his Gospel for the avowed purpose of proving that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, (John xx. 31.) opens his narrative by declaring that the Logos, who was in the beginning with God, who was God and the Creator of the universe, became flesh and dwelt among men for the purpose of imparting to them spiritual light and life; and that men beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. (i. 1—14.) In confirmation of his own statements, he introduces the testimony of John the Baptist, who affirmed that Christ was far more exalted than himself, that he existed before him, and that he alone was able to impart a definite knowledge of God, on account of his intimate and peculiar connection with him. (i. 15—18.) John opens his first Epistle with an elaborate declaration of the actual appearance of Christ in the flesh, in opposition to those who denied the reality of his human nature; (1 John, i. 1—3.) this notion he asserts to be subversive to Christianity; (iv. 2, 3.) and concludes the Epistle by affirming that Christ is the true God and eternal life. (v. 20, compare John xx. 28.) For the testimony of this apostle respecting the Spirit, see John i. 13 compared with iii. 5, 6, 8; also i. 32, 33. 1 John, v. 6, and the like passages. Here are numerous assertions of the Deity and humanity of Christ, and of the existence and agency of the Spirit; but no philosophical theory.

The apostle Paul represents Christ as a descendant of David as to his corporeal nature, but the powerful Son of God as to his holy, spiritual nature; (Rom. i. 3, 4.) he calls him God expressly and without limitation; (Rom. ix. 5. 1. Tim. iii. 15. Tit. ii. 13.) the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, by whom all things in heaven and earth were created; (Col. i. 15, 16) the possessor and bestower of all divine favors; (Col. ii. 9.) the Lord and Judge of all men; (Rom. xiv. 9. 2 Cor. v. 10. Phil. iii, 21, compare Phil. ii. 6, 7.) and represents him as the object of divine worship, to whom our prayers may be addressed.

Paul frequently speaks of the existence and agency of the Holy Spirit; (1 Cor. xii. 3—9, et ii. 10—15.) and places the Spirit in the most intimate connection with the Father and Son. (2 Cor. xiii. 13.)

The apostle has asserted these several facts, and referred to them as well known and generally acknowledged; but he enters into no particular explanation of them, and gives us no information by which we can satisfy our curiosity respecting the precise relation which the Father, Son, and Spirit maintain to each other, or the mode of the divine existence.

The above references to Scripture are by no means intended as a complete exhibition of the Scriptural evidence in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity. As has already been intimated, the more direct and striking passages only are adduced, that the reader, by

examining and comparing them, may see the light in which the subject presented itself to the minds of the sacred writers, and that he may observe with what freedom they refer to Christ, either as God or man, according to the light in which they are viewing him at the time, apparently without apprehending any danger of being misunderstood, and without any fear of incurring the charge of inconsistency or absurdity.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The Christian teachers who were the immediate successors of the Apostles and had enjoyed their personal instructions, are called Apostolic Fathers. Of the writings which bear their name, but few can be relied upon as genuine, and even those, for the most part, have been more or less corrupted and interpolated. In my quotations, I shall confine myself to those which are generally acknowledged to be genuine and uninjured.

On examining these remains of the primitive age, one cannot but observe their striking inferiority to the books of the New Testament. Though written by the scholars and immediate followers of the Apostles, who possessed as much learning, and some of them probably as much native talent as their masters, and equal opportunities for intellectual cultivation, they generally exhibit but little of the simplicity and strong good sense of the Apostolic writings, and in this way afford convincing proof that the New Testament must have been written by inspiration of God.

The Apostolic Fathers employ themselves principally in earnest exhortations to their brethren to fulfil the practical duties enjoined by the Gospel, with few allusions to doctrinal subjects, and no attempt to philosophise, or to form a system of theology.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE OF ST. BARNABAS. We come first to the Epistle attributed to St. Barnabas. It is known that this Epistle was extant in the Alexandrian church in the second century of the Christian era, and Dr. Lardner pronounces it genuine. He says of the writer, "that he resembles St. Paul as his fellow laborer, without copying him." (Credibility, vol. ii. p. 30.) The contents of the Epistle, however, are of such a nature that I find it difficult to persuade myself that it was written by the companion of Paul. His interpretations of the Old Testament are different from those of Paul; he shows the turn of mind peculiar to a converted Jew of the Alexandrian school; and breathes the spirit of Philo rather than that of the Apostle to the Gentiles. (See Neander, Kirchengesch. Band I. S. 1100.) The Epistle, however, undoubtedly belongs to the first age of the church.

I find in it but few passages which bear on the subject of the present investigation, and these not of a very decisive character.

"The Lord consented to suffer for our souls, though he is the Lord of the whole earth; to whom God said before the beginning of the world, *Let us make man after our own image and like-*

ness." "If he had not come in the flesh, how could we (men) seeing him, have been preserved alive? Since they who see the sun, *which is the work of his hands*, and shall hereafter cease to be, cannot look directly on his rays. Wherefore the Son of God came in flesh for this purpose," &c. Cap. v.

This writer represents Christ as the God who appeared to Moses in the mount, and delivered to him the tables of stone; (Cap. xiv.) and speaks of him repeatedly as 'the Son of God,' the 'Lord of all,' who shall hereafter 'judge both the quick and dead.' Cap. vii.

CLEMENS ROMANUS. The next writer is Clemens Romanus, the friend of Paul, and bishop of the church at Rome during the first century. (See Phil. iv. 3.) The only writing of his, which we can rely upon as genuine, is the first Epistle to the Corinthians. This is almost entirely of a practical nature, and contains very little doctrinal instruction.

Cap. xvi. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the sceptre of the majesty of God, did not come in the boasting of arrogance and pride, although able (*δυναμεως*), but in humility, as the Holy Spirit said respecting him.' He then quotes nearly the whole of the fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah as relating to Christ.

In other parts of this Epistle, Clemens speaks of Christ as 'the High Priest of all our offerings,' and 'the defender and helper of our weakness,' by whom 'the eyes of our hearts are opened,' our 'foolish and darkened understandings' are enlightened, and 'we look up to the highest heavens;'—to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.' Cap. xxxiv. and Cap. l.

HERMAS. The next writing is entitled the Shepherd of Hermas. The ancients generally supposed it to be the work of the Hermas mentioned by Paul, Rom. xvi. 14; and Lardner is of the same opinion, (Credibility, vol. ii. p. 113.) Neander, however, considers this doubtful, though he supposes the author to be a cotemporary of Clemens. (Kirchengesch. B. I. S. 1107.) The work was originally written in Greek; but it has come down to us, for the most part, only in a Latin translation.

'Hear now for what purpose God took his Son and the good angels into council about dividing the inheritance. He placed the holy spirit, which was created first of all, in the body in which God should dwell, namely, in a chosen body as it pleased him.' Lib. iii. Cap. vi. In translating this passage, I follow the reading of Grabe, as probably the most correct. The sentence is varied in Cotelierius, (see vol. i. p. 107,) and still more by Roesler, as translated by Professor Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Miller, pp. 19, 20. The words, 'holy spirit,' may here be used to designate the human soul of Christ, a usage not unfrequent among the Fathers. The whole passage, however, (from Cap. iv. to vi.) is attended with so much difficulty and apparent confusion of thought, that I

confess myself unable to feel satisfied with regard to its meaning. The writer at first speaks of God as consulting the Holy Spirit respecting the reward of the Son; and then (in the passage quoted) of the Holy Spirit being placed in the body in which God should dwell; of this body faithfully serving the Spirit which dwelt within it, and on this account being esteemed worthy of being rewarded by God, etc. (See Muenscher. B. I. S. 390.)

Lib. iii. Cap. xii. The Son of God, indeed, is more ancient than every creature, so that he was present with the Father in council at the creation (*ad condendam creaturam*.)

IGNATIUS. The next of the Apostolic Fathers whom I shall quote is Ignatius, bishop of the church of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom at Rome, in the reign of the emperor Trajan, near the close of the first century. Seven of the Epistles which bear his name, and which he is said to have written while on his journey to Rome, are generally allowed to be genuine. They are extant in two forms, a larger and a smaller; the former of which are universally acknowledged to be very much corrupted and interpolated, and some able writers are disposed to place but little confidence in the latter. Respecting the genuineness of these Epistles, Lardner expresses himself as follows: 'Whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question.' 'As the interpolations of the larger Epistles are plainly the work of some Arian, so even the smaller Epistles may have been tampered with by the Arians, or the Orthodox, or both; though I don't affirm, there are in them any considerable corruptions or alterations.' (*Credibility*, vol. ii. pp. 153, 155.) The smaller Epistles, at least, bear marks of great antiquity, and from them I shall quote. (Compare Neander, *Kirchengesch.* B. I. S. 1107.)

Epist. at Ephes. Cap. vii. 'There is one physician, both carnal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God existing in flesh, in deathless true life, [or according to another reading, 'in death true life,'] both of Mary and God, first subject to passion, and then without passion, (*πρωτον παθης και τοτε απαθης*) even Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Epist. at Magnes. Cap. vi. 'Jesus Christ, who was with the Father from eternity, (*πρω αιωνων*) and in the end made his appearance.'

Cap. viii. 'For there is one God, who hath revealed himself by Jesus Christ, who is his eternal Logos, not proceeding from silence (*σιγης*), who in all things pleased him that sent him.'

In the following passage, (Cap. xiii.) we have a strong allusion to the Trinity. 'Submit to your overseer, and to one another, as Jesus Christ according to the flesh does to the Father, and the Apostles to Christ and the Father and the Holy Spirit.'

Epist. ad Polycarp. Cap. iii. 'Consider the times, and look for him who is above all time, eternal, invisible, though for our sakes made manifest; impalpable and impassible, though subjected to suffering for us.'

Ignatius frequently speaks of Jesus Christ as God. 'Allow me to imitate the suffering of my God.' 'I glorify God, even Jesus Christ.' 'All happiness in our God, Jesus Christ.' 'The deacons of Christ, our God,' &c.*

POLYCARP. Polycarp was a disciple of the Apostle John, and is thought by some to have been that 'angel of the church in Smyrna,' addressed in the second chapter of the Revelation. He suffered martyrdom about A. D. 147. Of his writings nothing remains, except an Epistle to the Philippians. He speaks of Christ as having been 'brought to death for our sins'—'to whom all things are now subjected, both in heaven and on earth, whom every living creature shall worship.' Cap. i. and ii.

Besides the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, from which I have here quoted, there is a Relation of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, and an Epistle of the church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp, both of which are thought by good judges to have been written in the age immediately following that of the Apostles. 'The first of these pieces concludes with the following ascription: 'By whom (Christ) and with whom, all glory and power be to the Father, with the blessed Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.'—From the second, it appears that the Christians who followed Polycarp to the stake were forbidden by their enemies to save any part of his dead body from the consuming flame, 'Lest,' said they, 'you should forsake Him that was crucified, and worship this Polycarp;'—'not considering,' continue the Smyrneans, 'that it is not possible for us ever to forsake Christ....nor worship any other besides him. For him indeed, the Son of God, we adore; but as for the martyrs, we worthily love them, as the disciples and followers of our Lord.' Cap. xvii.

The dying prayer of Polycarp is represented as concluding in the following manner: 'I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, by the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom, to thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and to all succeeding ages. Amen.' Cap. xiv. The Epistle itself concludes with a similar ascription: 'To him (Christ) be honor, glory, majesty and an eternal throne, from generation to generation. Amen. We wish you, brethren, all happiness, by living according to the rule of the gospel of Jesus Christ, with whom be glory to God the Father, and the Holy Spirit, for the salvation of his chosen saints.'

* Epist. ad Rom. Cap. vi. ad Smyr. Cap. i. and x. ad Polycarp. Cap. viii. ad Ephes. Cap. xviii.

REMARKS ON JUDGE HOPKINSON'S LETTER, IN A LETTER
TO ——— ESQ. ATTORNEY AT LAW.

The Letter remarked on in the following communication was written by Judge Hopkinson of Philadelphia to his friend in England. The learned Judge inveighs earnestly against the study of theology, and the pursuit of religious truth. "I have seldom seen a man able to embark in such discussions and studies, without becoming an enthusiast or a bigot." Questions of this nature "have been undecided for thousands of years, and will forever remain so." "The precepts of a good and acceptable life are accessible to *all the human race*, as the air they breathe in common, the sun which shines on them all alike, and the food and water which refresh them. Has God given to *all men* whatever is necessary for the support and health of their perishable bodies, and withheld almost from *all* that which is indispensable to their eternal welfare? This is the impious conceit of the few, who persuade themselves that they have the saving secret, the immortal panacea!"—"I have all my life avoided all knotty and disputed points in religion. I argue with nobody about the trinity or unity of the Godhead; the mysteries of free knowledge and free will; or the profound doctrine of the atonement by the death of Christ. I read nothing about them—I affirm or deny nothing—I know nothing. I profess not to understand them; and I know that much wiser and stronger men have come to no understanding about them, after centuries of learned and intolerant disputation, in which rivers of blood, as well as ink, have flowed in support of this savage and unchristian warfare." "I consider religion to have nothing to do with theologians, and the questions of the schools." "Although I have been a constant and very general reader for more than forty years, I have never perused one page of any writer upon any controverted question of religion, not even a sermon."

And so, my dear friend, you have read Judge Hopkinson's letter with deep interest, and ask my opinion of its contents. I shall despatch in few words what I may find to say in answer to your inquiries and suggestions.

You say, that you cannot help wishing that Judge Hopkinson's views of thorough religious discussion—of a full and anxious examination of the doctrines of the Bible, may be shown to be sound and creditable. You admire them for the sake of *their convenience*. For, if whatever is requisite to "a good and acceptable life" is as obvious "to all the human race, as the sun which shines upon them," and may be secured with as little solicitude and effort, as "the air, they breathe in common," then what need of intense anxiety, fervent prayer, and exhausting study, to find and pursue the path-way to Heaven? And what a delightful privilege to be assured, that we may move on "with the multitude" through this merry world, secure of eternal blessedness at last.—But is this privilege, which with such animation you call delightful, actually conferred upon us? This question, my dear

friend, we should do well, first of all, with a candid mind and a serious spirit, to examine and to settle.

The only argument, on which, so far as I can see, Judge H. relies for the support of his views, is derived from *analogy*. "Has God," he exclaims, "given to *all men* whatever is necessary for the support and health of their perishable bodies, and withheld almost from all that which is indispensable for their eternal welfare?" The point, you will perceive at once, which this analogy is brought to illustrate and support, is, not whether what "is indispensable to their eternal welfare" is placed within the reach of mankind generally, *but whether this may be secured without anxiety and effort*. What this argument is worth, it requires no great depth of penetration or stretch of thought to determine. Is it to be admitted then, that men may make provision for "the support and health of their perishable bodies" without anxiety and effort? If they neglect to employ the appropriate means of supplying their present wants, is there no danger of distress to themselves and their families? And are men able to enrich themselves with intellectual acquisitions with as little solicitude and effort, as "they breathe the air" or catch the sunbeams? Let the neglected family and clients of poor Condry, whose mispence of time and strength Judge H. so feelingly describes, answer these inquiries? This Mr. Condry, it seems, "was a man of distinguished learning in the profession of the law, and also of general knowledge and scholarship, with a most acute and penetrating mind. He would have been at the head of the bar, with wealth, reputation, and all the good he could have desired." Well, what hindered him from rising to such an eminence, and laying his hand on such substantial good? Why, the man neglected or abandoned his professional studies, his law books were laid aside, his clients unattended to. And what harm could come of that? Did not the sun continue to shine upon him? Did not the vital air still breathe upon him? And "whatever was necessary for the support and health of his perishable body," according to our oracle, he was sure of receiving on the same terms with air and sun-light. So far, then, as the bodily wants of himself and family were concerned, might he not with the utmost safety give his days and nights to "Hebrew bibles, Latin folios and learned criticisms and commentaries?" But alas, our learned Judge spoils his own analogy—destroys his own argument. For Mr. Condry was "soon involved in the embarrassment of debt, and after a most miserable existence, died a few months since of a broken and mortified spirit, leaving a wife and children destitute." And all this, merely for neglecting solicitude and effort to promote his temporal interests! And this, too, under the government of a God, who affords "all men whatever is necessary for the support and health of their perishable bodies," on the same conditions on which he imparts the vital air and the

beams of the sun ! The history of Mr. Condry sets in a glaring light the emptiness of Judge H.'s analogy. The argument stands thus ; by giving over anxiety and effort in his professional pursuits Mr. Condry lost his reputation and beggared his family ;—the inference, therefore, is plain and irresistible, that anxiety and effort cannot be requisite to secure those higher and more endearing benefits, which religion bids us seek !

A stranger to the condition of mankind would expect, from Judge H.'s reasoning and conclusions, to find the human family everywhere enjoying, without any deep solicitude or spirited exertions to obtain them, all those benefits on which their happiness depends. With this expectation, let him go abroad upon the face of the earth and visit the habitations of men. Would he find them everywhere enjoying ease and plenty ? Would he everywhere find the cultivated intellect—the well-informed mind ? Every where, would he feel the prevalence of true freedom ? Or would he not find, that these benefits could no where be secured—however freely sunlight might be dispensed—without solicitude and labor ?—labor often agonizing, and solicitude not unfrequently exhausting ? Yes, surely. And facts, stubborn and notorious facts would impel him to the conclusion—however *inconsistent* it might appear—that *in proportion to the value of the benefits we need, is the strenuousness of efforts demanded to secure them.* Judge then, my dear friend, whether *analogy* leads us to expect ETERNAL LIFE without care and exertion ? Or whether it is not adapted to work in us the conviction, that if we would rise to Heaven, we must “*strive*” to find and pursue the narrow way.

On what ground, Judge H. could say, that “religion had nothing to do with theologians,” I am unable to conceive. What does *he* claim to know of the principles, which they regard as lying at the very foundation of religion ? What would he think of a judge, who, on a legal question of high importance,* involving much, that was profound in principle, remote in analogy, and intricate in argument, should hold language like the following : ‘Lawyers may say what they will of the principles of jurisprudence. They may urge with whatever zeal they choose their various analogies and conflicting references. Knotty and disputed points in law I have always avoided. About such things, I read nothing, I affirm or deny nothing, I know nothing. Why should I spend my time and waste my strength in poring over thousands of pages, miscalled learned institutes and labored commentaries. The dry definitions and barbarous technicalities of legal science ; what are they to me ? The precepts of a good and acceptable life are accessible to all the human race, as the air they breathe in common, the sun which shines on them all alike, and the food and water, which refresh

* For instance, Dartmouth College, vs. Woodward.

them. I consider equity to have nothing to do with jurists. Every man knows what is right and what is wrong. Although I have been a constant and very general reader for more than forty years I have never perused a single page of any writer on any controverted law-question, not even a report!

Judge H. needs not to be informed, that the *principles of science* have in different departments of life a bearing more or less direct and strong on the welfare of man. It is true, that practical results are often secured by those, who are ignorant of the principles, on which these results depend. What then? Would our learned Judge infer, that the arts have nothing to do with the sciences? Would he assert, that the latter might be despised and forgotten without hazard to the former? Had Judge H. witnessed the efforts, which, on scientific principles, Sir Humphrey Davy made to provide the "safety lamp" for the benefit of miners, he would have said, had he spoken in the spirit of the letter under hand; 'Study as you will the nature of flame, you are toiling in a barren field. Look around you. The ground is white with the bones of rash enthusiasts, who spent their strength in idle efforts to explore the secrets of nature, and turn them to good account. I consider useful arts to have nothing to do with scientific men. And this opinion deserves your careful consideration; for I speak on a subject, on which I read nothing, I affirm or deny nothing, I know nothing.' But had the Chemist, under the weight of such advice, abandoned his design, would the world have lost nothing? Let the hundreds, for whom he has furnished an effectual shield against a dreaded death, answer this inquiry, in the blessings they are continually pouring upon his memory!

Do you inquire, whether the connection between the principles of theological science and practical religion is as intimate and strong, as between science and art in other departments of human life? Most certainly. The leading principle of Christian theology—a principle which Judge H. expressly declares he always treated with marked indifference—is "*the profound doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ.*" Now, will Judge H. affirm, that the Christian religion has anywhere, or at any time, exerted upon a barbarous people its enlightening, purifying influence;—that it has anywhere or at any time enriched a heathen community with the peculiar blessings, which spring from its prevalence, without the agency of this principle? Let him point, if he is able, to a single spot on the globe, where the fruits of a Christian life have been produced, without the influence of this "profound doctrine." He has for "more than forty years been a constant and very general reader." Now, suppose a youth, in whose welfare he feels a lively interest, and to whose inquiries on literary subjects he often

lends his ear, should spread out beneath his eye the page in Cesar's Commentaries, where that warrior describes the habits of the ancient Britons. 'Dear Sir,' I hear the tyro say, 'if I construe this paragraph correctly, the old Britons were as brutal savages as I ever heard of. To say nothing of the shocking cruelty of their religious rites, what loathsome scenes must * *domestic life* among them have furnished ! A tyger's den must have been a sort of paradise, compared with a Briton's hovel. But pray, Sir, who taught the Britons better ? By what means were they led to give up their bloody rites ? How did they acquire a relish for the refined joys of the well regulated fireside ?' In reply, could Judge H. avoid directing the young inquirer to the exertions of *Christian missionaries* ? Would he not think it right, to let the apostle Paul explain the method, which the ancient missionaries pursued in their efforts to reform the pagan world ? And would he not thus find himself insensibly led to the foot of the Cross ? There, the words of the Apostle would fall with impressive weight upon the ear ; " I determined" in my official labors " to know nothing, save Jesus Christ and *Him crucified*."†

Perhaps, during his forty years of general reading, Judge H. may have "occupied and amused himself," for some leisure hour, with the history of missionary efforts among the Greenlanders. With his "generous" feelings, he could not fail to be delighted with the happy change in their character and condition, which under God resulted from these efforts. And did he notice by *what means* this change was wrought ? He did not surely start back from this point, for fear of pricking himself with the thorns of theological controversy. He may know, then, that those doctrines, which are "accessible to all men," were urged long and earnestly on these poor savages, without any valuable result. He may know, that the happy effects which were wrought at length in their character and condition, were most manifestly and undeniably produced, through divine grace, by "the profound doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ." He may know, if he will take the trouble to inquire, that wherever practical Christianity has prevailed, the world over, it has owed its prevalence, under God, to the influence of this and kindred doctrines. Wherever these doctrines are withheld, practical religion withers and dies. The fruits of holiness grow on no soil, which has not been wet with the blood of atonement. "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness ; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."‡

You have often been told, my dear friend, that the men, whose authority seemed so much to awe you, whatever they might know

* Cesar Com. L. 5. sec. 14.

† 1 Cor. 2 : 2.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 23, 24.

on other subjects, knew little of the Bible. But to you it appeared incredible, that grave men would confidently affirm and promptly deny on ground which they never had explored. But this, *on his own showing*, Judge H. has done, and done without a blush. In one breath, he tells us, that about these things, "he reads nothing, he affirms and denies nothing, he knows nothing." In the next, as if giving solemn judgment on this subject, he declares, "I consider religion to have nothing to do with theologians!" Thus he makes a leap in the dark. What child ought to be moved by such authority? He "knows nothing, affirms nothing, denies nothing;" and yet *affirms* that there is no connection between theology and religion! And in this rash and reckless manner, not a few men of mighty name, publish their opinions, and pass their judgement on religious matters. Many of them know as little about the truths, peculiar to the Gospel, as the Brahmins of India. Yet they "speak great swelling words of vanity" about things, of which they are profoundly ignorant; and expect their authority will sway the entire community around them!

And here, you will pardon me if I say, that you are in danger of being led astray by the *authority of names*. You have been wont to regard the opinions of such men as Judge H. with great deference. You hear him speak contemptuously of religious inquiries and theologians. For many reasons, his views are grateful to your feelings, and "convenient" to your wishes and designs. And as on many other subjects, you know, that these men examine the points they speak of, before they pronounce their judgement, you are in danger of taking it as granted, that on this point also, they act a part no less reasonable. Let the acknowledgement of one of their number put you on your guard. What are Judge H.'s views worth on subjects, of which, he owns, he "knows nothing?" *Examine for yourself*. And remember, that then only can you hope to "find the knowledge of God," when you "search for it as for hid treasures."*

Judge H. must blot his paper with the old slander, that religious controversy hath sanguinary tendencies. From such doctrines as atonement by the death of Christ, he starts back with horror, lest he should be plunged into some river of blood, which such controversy has originated. And what if wicked men have made the Gospel the occasion of bloodshed? Is this a sufficient reason why you and I and Judge H. himself, should not study the Gospel? Has *infidelity* no sanguinary tendencies? I have nowhere seen so much of a relentless, persecuting spirit as in the very men, who adopt, as expressive of their views, the letter of Judge H. While they profess to be equally indifferent to all kinds of religion, they lose no opportunity of spitting out their venom upon what I regard

* Prov. ii; 4, 5.

as the religion of the Bible. Our Judge himself can *sneer*. He can curl his lip and point his finger at "the few who persuade themselves, that they have the saving secret, the immortal panacea!" Was it an "impious conceit," then, in the Son of God to cherish and express the conviction, that "few" would find the way to Heaven?

But, oh, these rivers of blood!—Young Napoleon demands of Methericht; 'Pray what is the meaning of the words *liberty* and *freedom*? Among my mother's papers I saw a strange book, once belonging to the Emperor my father, about all men being created with equal rights. What is the import of such language?'—'You present an inquiry,' the Austrian minister replies, 'about which I read nothing, I affirm or deny nothing, I know nothing. I profess not to understand the principles of liberty; and I know that much wiser and stronger men have come to no understanding about them, after centuries of learned and intolerant disputation, in which rivers of blood, as well as ink, have flowed in support of this savage and unchristian warfare. I mix not in such strife. *I consider human happiness to have nothing to do with the advocates of freedom.*' The royal boy bows to the authority of the wily minister; well satisfied with a decision *so clear and well-grounded!*

The "Register,"* you say, treats Judge H. with great courtesy. True. The manner in which Unitarians defend Christianity against the attacks of such unbelievers, reminds me of an expedient, resorted to by an old acquaintance, for the purpose of retaining a due influence in his family. Whenever he overheard his wife and daughters determining how any matter should be disposed of, he would embrace the first opportunity to propose, as of his own mind, the very arrangement which they had originated.—In much the same spirit, our Unitarian confessor approaches the learned unbeliever. In a suppliant tone, he begs leave to inquire, whether he may not be a Unitarian instead of an infidel. I hear him say; 'Do you reject the doctrine of the Trinity? So do we. Do you deny Divine honors to the Son of God? So do we. Do you refuse to believe that there is any Holy Ghost? So do we. Do you claim for man a native character free from any spot of guilt? Not more earnestly than we do. Do you look with aversion and disgust on the doctrine of regenerating grace? We cordially sympathize with you in relation to this subject. Do you regard an eternal hell as a figment of affrighted fancy? So do we. Do you ask, how we can deny such doctrines when they are clearly taught in the Bible? We no more believe in the plenary inspiration of the Bible than yourself. Why then should you expose yourself to the odium which avowed unbelief incurs, when our

* See Christian Register, Vol. 9. No. 16.

communion-table furnishes a retreat, where you may cherish your infidelity under the milder name of rational Christianity?"—Will our learned Judge avail himself of an expedient, so ingenious, appropriate, and safe?

My dear friend, will a new name change the qualities of a confirmed character? Let us remember, that we have to do with a holy God, one who cannot be deceived, and will not be mocked. Whatever it may cost us, let us ascertain his will, and secure his favor.

Yours, &c. ——— ———

REVIEWS.

1. PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.
2. PUBLICATIONS OF PRESBYTERIAN, BAPTIST, AND EPISCOPAL EDUCATION SOCIETIES *in the United States*.
3. EXAMINATION OF THE REVIEW OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY: *Published in the Biblical Repertory at Princeton, N. J.* With a Postscript. By MOSES STUART.

THE interest which Education societies—such as those to which reference is made at the head of this article—are now exciting in the church, connected with the extended influence which they are destined to exert, justly claims for them the particular attention of a religious periodical. And the reason why this great theme, so rich in materials and so interesting in detail, has not found a place on our pages before, is not because we have paid no attention to it, or have deemed it of secondary importance. The present position and aspects of this cause, now especially urge it upon our attention, and seem to threaten us with rebuke, if we continue silent.

We begin with presenting a brief Historical notice of the origin and progress of Education Societies.

A society of this description was established in Bristol, England, in 1686, by the donation of Mr. Edward Terrill of that city. Before 1700, it seems that the students, who received its patronage, were placed under the care of ministers in different places. About twenty-five years ago, another Baptist Education Society was formed in England, called "the Northern Baptist Education Society." The Society at Bristol, in 1824, had assisted 120 men in their preparation for the ministry. We are not informed of the existence of any other societies in England, or on the continent,

especially for this object, unless it be the Moravian Church, which is indeed an Education Society, but altogether of a different structure, and for more general purposes, than those institutions, the history of which it is our design to trace. It should not be overlooked, however, that there are sundry provisions and foundations for the support of indigent candidates for the ministry, in the Universities of Great Britain, and the continent. The several Dissenting Academies in England are also, to a very considerable extent, Education Societies. Distinguished individuals, in that country, like the Thorntons, have done much in this way for the promotion of truth.

“In the United States, for a long period, pious and indigent young men have been assisted at the different Colleges and Seminaries of learning. In 1807, the Theological Seminary at Andover was founded. Very valuable pecuniary assistance, in many ways, has been furnished by the founders and patrons of this Seminary, in preparing young men to be preachers of the Gospel. The same is true of the Princeton, Auburn, and other Theological Institutions. The first Education Society in the United States, which has come to our knowledge, was formed in the vicinity of Dorset, Vt., in 1807. The Religious Charitable Society of Worcester County, which operated in part as an Education Society, was instituted in 1811. In 1813, a society was formed, embracing the counties of Plymouth, Bristol, and Barnstable, Mass., called the *Benevolent Education Society*. This society, within a few months, has become Auxiliary to the American Education Society.

“The *Massachusetts Baptist Education Society* was formed in 1814. In 1818, a *Protestant Episcopal Education Society* went into operation at Washington, D. C. In 1820, the *Connecticut Baptist Education Society* was organized. The *Baptist Education Society* of New York has been in existence twelve years.” The above named societies have done well in the cause they have undertaken, and we believe are constantly increasing in resources and efficiency.

In 1805, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, took *special order* on this subject, and enjoined it upon the particular attention of their numerous Presbyteries. And we have reason to believe, that the Presbyteries have not been unmindful of their duty. In 1819, the General Assembly organized a standing committee, or *Board of Education*, which, besides their immediate influence between the Assembly and Presbyteries, reported twenty-four beneficiaries under their care in 1825; nineteen in 1826; eighteen in 1827; nineteen in 1828; and eighteen in 1829. This Board was re-organized in 1829, and has now become an important institution. It publishes a *Monthly Register*, is at present assisting more than forty young men, and promises great efficiency in the common cause.

The Presbyterian Education Society, organized in 1818, and now Auxiliary to the American Education Society, consists chiefly of individual members of the Presbyterian Church, living in the states of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The number of young men, patronized by this society, has recently exceeded one hundred a year. It includes the *Western Education Society* of the state of New York, which is another very important institution.

There are numerous minor auxiliary associations, scattered over the country, on which the great cause very much depends. There are, we believe, some important associations for charitable Education in the Western States, the names and dates of which are not at our hand. So far as the Presbyterian Church extends, the Presbyteries are generally the medium of fulfilling this duty. Every Presbytery in the United States,—of which there are ninety two—is virtually an Education Society for its own limits. And there are very few Presbyteries which have not more or less young men in a course of education.

The acknowledged magnitude of this subject—the great disadvantage of scattered, unconcentrated effort—and the necessity of an organized and systematic operation, with one centre and one soul, not only for the general purposes of economy, but for the greater perfection of the whole plan, and for greater efficiency in accomplishing it—gave rise to the *American Education Society*, in 1815. The principles, on which this Society was organized—its enlarged and liberal policy—its wise provisions against abuse and perversion—together with its bold and efficient occupation of the field of its enterprise—have greatly commended it to the public confidence.

As the American Education Society is the largest and most important institution of this class, that has sprung up in our country, and, so far as we know, in the present age ;—as it has fairly taken the lead in this great enterprize, formed a system peculiarly its own, and gone into efficient operation upon a very extended plan—thus challenging public scrutiny, and depending upon the public patronage ;—it is due to such an undertaking, to examine its principles, and to weigh in the balance of truth and justice the results it has attained.

The results of the operations of the American Education Society may be divided into two classes,—*direct* and *indirect*. Its direct results comprehend the number of young men patronized, the number of additional ministers brought into the field, and the amount of their usefulness. The number of men patronized by the American Education Society, since its organization in 1815, we believe exceeds *one thousand* ;—the number actually introduced into the ministry about three hundred, including some forty or fifty who are now on the eve of engaging publicly in the great

work. Between *four* and *five* hundred are in the different stages of their education, and a large portion of these far advanced.

It would be very difficult, nay impossible, to ascertain with any exactness, how many of these young men would have been forever debarred from the Christian ministry, independent of the A. E. Society and its auxiliaries. Perhaps one fifth—or one third—or more. Whichsoever of these numbers we assume as the supposition, and even though it be much less than either of them, it is still sufficiently great in itself, and in its immediate and probable results, to constitute a subject of the deepest interest to a benevolent mind. To calculate the probable fruits of these *extra* labors, (in the present sense *extra*) both here and hereafter, in the temporal and eternal train of their consequences, is indeed grateful, cheering, congratulatory. If there is joy in heaven over *one* sinner that repenteth;—let the Christian sit down and make a calculation on the following history :

“ During the last year,”—say the A. E. Society, in August, 1829—“ nearly *one tenth* of all the ordinations and installations in the United States which we could find mentioned in the public prints, were of former beneficiaries of this Society. From communications recently received, it is safe to conclude, that several thousands have professed religion within a few years under the ministry of men of this description. Many of them, if we may credit their own declarations, would not have been educated at all, or very imperfectly so, for the sacred office, had not this Society taken them by the hand, and assisted them on their way. One such minister, who was instrumental of several revivals of religion while in his course of education, and who has had the rare felicity of seeing *five hundred* members added to his church in two years, once said to the Secretary of the A. E. Society : ‘ Had it not been for the appeals which the Directors of your Society sent abroad, and the encouragement which they gave to indigent and pious young men, I know not that I should ever have been a minister.’ ”

It should be recollected, also, that several of the ordained missionaries of the American Board have been aided in their preparatory studies by the A. E. Society. Is it not fair to conclude, then, that converts are daily multiplying in Christian and pagan lands, and souls almost daily ascending to heaven, as a direct result of the operations of this Institution? And then to calculate the multiplication of these results into themselves, through the coming ages of this world, and through eternity—what an interesting and sublime spectacle! And then to look back, and view the actual and uninterrupted increase of this same original power, uttering upon the world continually the commencements of these self-accumulating results, this again is no less grateful and cheering.

The A. E. Society, then, has actually brought into the field not a few laborers, who would otherwise never have entered on the sacred work; many such it now has under its patronage, in a course of preparation; and by its special inducements, it is perpetually operating upon the great community of pious and promising young men in the land, summoning them from that destination to which their indigence had consigned them, and bidding them, in the

name of Jesus Christ, "*Go, work in my vineyard.*" And they rise, and go.

Such are some of the *direct* results of the institution and operations of the A. E. Society. Its *indirect* results are more numerous, more complicated, more difficult to be made palpable and to be appreciated ; but not, perhaps, less important ;—in many respects, more so.

The *example* of the A. E. Society has operated on other sections of the church, and on other denominations of Christians, to excite them to engage, in earnest, in the same great and glorious enterprise. This single result is perhaps already, in all its branches, equal to the inherent power of the original Institution. We hope it will soon be vastly greater.

The *general* influence of this society, in awakening a missionary spirit, and in challenging the attention of the Christian public to the spiritual wants of our land and world, constitutes no inconsiderable part of the good which it has been the means, indirectly, of accomplishing.

Owing to the purifying influence it has been able to throw into the public Literary Institutions scattered over the land by means of its young men in a course of education, and by furnishing the more eligible candidates for the offices of instruction ; a very manifest change for the better has already taken place in many of our academies and colleges.

The *reciprocal action* of the hallowed spirit of such an Institution, and of such an enterprise, upon its own immediate agents, upon its patrons, upon those whom it educates, upon its numerous branches and auxiliaries, and through them upon the Christian public generally, must necessarily be great and salutary.

The indirect influence of the A. E. Society in forming a public opinion, which will demand exemplary and devoted piety in the ministers of religion, is no inconsiderable item in this account. It has forced this subject upon the minds and hearts of Christians, till they cannot but see and feel its importance.

Among all the results of this Institution, that of introducing order and system into this important branch of Christian enterprise is, perhaps, one of the most valuable. Indeed, there is a strong probability, that the cause itself would have gone to wreck, without a redeeming influence of this kind. Every one who is even slightly acquainted with the history of this enterprise must know, that the forms under which it existed, soon after its importance began to be appreciated, and its appropriate spirit began to move, were in many respects very infelicitous, and extremely liable to disaster. Indeed, public confidence towards these efforts had already begun to decline, when the A. E. Society sprang into being, laid its hand upon the disconnected and dissolving materials, reduced them to order, and established a regular system of operation.

The last and most important result of the operations of this society, is the solution of the problem, whether a special and systematic effort of this sort can be carried forward to success and triumph. This question being now decided affirmatively before the world, a new and leading way is opened for the Christian Church to advance directly to the great work of evangelizing the nations. We say this is a *new* and *leading* way, at least, comparatively so. It is *leading* because the harvest cannot be gathered without laborers; and it is *new*, certainly, as a systematic enterprise. Heretofore the Christian world has depended upon seeming *casualties* for the supply of ministers of religion. It is now satisfactorily ascertained, that a prudential economy, of human structure, resting instrumentally on human sagacity and agency, is demanded and is necessary, in order to raise up an adequate supply of qualified religious teachers. The general maxim, '*Trust Providence*,' has been, and still is, greatly abused. It is made a wicked apology for sloth and negligence. To trust Providence for the supply of ministers of the Gospel, without doing anything ourselves to raise them up, is profane and presumptuous. God, by his Spirit, is multiplying the *materiel* of the Christian ministry, in the greatest abundance; and it only remains for Christians to look up that *materiel*, and give it a fashion suited to so high a destination. The *fashioning* of it, instrumentally, is the work of man—the original production is of God.

We now proceed to a consideration of the *principles* of the A. E. Society, more especially, as they affect the character and prospects of those who receive its aid.

The *financial* economy of this Institution we have particularly examined, and with much satisfaction. Its constitutional provisions against abuse of powers and perversion of funds, are all that the past experience and present aspect of similar institutions could well suggest or demand, consistent with an investment of power adequate to the efficient action of such a body. For ourselves, we are willing—and with us it is a maxim—to repose confidence, after selecting the most trustworthy agents of benevolent enterprise. It is impossible to do any thing with efficiency, and upon an extended plan, without such confidence. '*Nothing risked, nothing gained*,' is as applicable to moral enterprise, as to schemes for amassing wealth. And we think, too, there is less hazard now, than formerly, in reposing trust for benevolent objects. For there is a spirit abroad in the Christian world, which loves to do good for its own sake; which has learned by experience, '*that it is more blessed to give than to receive*;' and nothing would so much afflict a benevolent mind, as the thought of falling back into the cold and heartless regions of selfishness. We are willing also to risk something in the belief, that the world is growing better; that trustworthy men, of pure and disinterested purpose, are becoming more common; that the difficulties of abusing public con-

fidence are multiplying on all sides ; and that public opinion, exacting scrupulous fidelity in public servants, is constantly rising and increasing in its power. Standing, therefore, as we hope, on the eve of a renovated state of society, at the same time that we would throw in all convenient cautions and barriers against abuse of trust, we should deem it pusillanimous and wicked to embarrass and clog the operations of benevolent enterprise, and to subtract from their efficient power, simply because men *have* done wickedly, and may do so again. And further ; we hold it as a *principle*, that no great and good design can ever be successfully conducted on an extended scale, such as the wants of man and the conversion of the world demand, without reposing a paramount degree of confidence in its official agents.

So long, therefore, as the A. E. Society, or any other benevolent institution, shall continue an annual *exposé* of their internal history, and adventure their fundamental principles and most secret springs to public scrutiny, we are willing and glad to entrust them with all the funds they have any prospect of acquiring, for the sake of the good they are likely to accomplish.

It is an interesting feature of the A. E. Society, that it adopts young men into a filial relation, and in return for this privilege, requires of them a filial responsibility. The moral influence of this principle, we conceive is very important and salutary. The subject of it, so far as this matter is concerned, is an *orphan*, and unable of himself to go forward in preparation for the work, which he professes to desire. He is confessedly the subject of actual indigence—feels his dependence—and without assistance from some quarter, must resign the object which is dearest to his heart. It is to relieve, encourage, and patronise such individuals, that the Education Society comes in. It takes them by the hand, tells them not to despair, and assures them of needful assistance. It cannot be concealed, that such is the condition of all suitable candidates for the patronage of Education Societies. It is this alone, which entitles them to aid.

To talk, therefore, of consulting a set of feelings, which cannot be supposed to exist in such cases, as some, in their reasonings upon this subject, have thought it necessary to do, is altogether out of the question. It is pecuniary *dependence*, and not *independence*, with which Education Societies have to do. And those who really need their patronage, and who would be benefitted by it, feel it to be a privilege and a favor. With them it is no trifling affair, that an Institution of such high consideration, and of such benevolent designs, should volunteer its assistance and guidance, at such a needful hour, and through such an eventful period.

In return for this kindness and patronage, the young men are required to render such an account of their means of support, independent of the Society under whose patronage they are, such renewed

and well-authenticated certificates of their continued claims to patronage, with such reports of their various expenditures, as shall enable their patrons, in turn, to render an account of the faithful discharge of their trust, as stewards of the public bounty. It is manifest, that nothing short of an accountability of this sort, and to this extent, would answer the purposes of such an institution.

And the advantage of such a system of accountability to the beneficiaries, in establishing habits of economy and of reckoning with themselves, is of no small account. Accuracy and punctuality in business are thus made a part of their education, and incorporated with their habits of living—a great desideratum in the practical concerns of life, and what is too common a defect with men of liberal education. And thus, for the privileges of their adoption, the young men are tasked with a course of discipline, not only necessary to the perfection of such a system, but most important to them in the formation of their habits. We are aware, that this accountability has been objected to. But we cannot find it in our hearts to enter upon a grave consideration of the arguments, by which these objections are attempted to be sustained. They are not, in our estimation, of sufficient weight to deserve a formal refutation.

The next consideration of importance in this system, is the loaning of money *without interest*, instead of giving it. This is not now a peculiar feature of the A. E. Society, inasmuch as it has been adopted by several other similar institutions in our country, as their publications will show. The Board of Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church have adopted a rule on this subject, which, we confess, we do not fully understand. The following is the rule at length :—

“ That no *written* obligation shall be required of any beneficiary to refund the monies, which may be granted him by this Board ;—because, we act upon the principle, that the church, as a moral parent, ought to provide for the education of such of her sons as may be indigent, and at the same time may probably become her faithful servants in the ministry of reconciliation. *But we nevertheless desire every beneficiary to remember, that his duty to the church, to his younger brethren, and to his Saviour, requires, that as soon as he is able, he shall refund the benefaction conferred on him, with interest. Every beneficiary shall be furnished with an attested copy of this resolution.*”

For the better understanding of this rule, it may be divided into two parts ; the first being a sort of *preamble*, involving the declaration of a principle, viz. that the church is bound to educate her indigent candidates for the ministry at her own expense, and consequently, as most people would infer, they are not bound to *refund* ;—the last clause, which we have marked in Italics, being virtually the rule itself. To reconcile the principle with the rule is more than *we* are able to do. The church are bound to *give*, as the preamble asserts ;—the beneficiaries, according to the rule, are bound to *refund*, with interest.

If the Board intended to make their rule differ from that of the A. E. Society, the difference appears to us to be this : The lat-

ter Institution requires the personal responsibility of the beneficiary, under his signature, for the *principal*, as soon as convenient to himself; and on condition of certain specialties, such as misfortune, or assignment to a peculiarly self-denying field of labor, he is discharged from his obligation altogether. Whereas, the Assembly's Board have imposed upon the consciences of their beneficiaries, unconditionally, and under three specific solemnities—'duty to the church, to younger brethren, and to the Saviour'—the whole amount of the monies passed to them, principal and interest. What, then, avails the declaration in the preamble?—We conclude, on the whole, that the Board are looking well to the refunding of their money, and have virtually declared in favor of the loaning system. Under one form or another, we have little doubt that this system will universally prevail.

The practice of *loaning* money, instead of giving it, has not been introduced unadvisedly, but is the result of experience and observation. In the incipient stages of this enterprise, it was probably unthought of. Young men were often selected without discretion, and supplied with assistance without system or rule, until the want of economy, and in some instances the disappointment of benefactors by the failure of their beneficiaries to enter the ministry, had very considerably chilled this species of benevolence, and threatened to reduce the enterprise to wreck. At this juncture, the A. E. Society came into being, with the hope of forming a system of extended operation, and of recovering and establishing public confidence. The results of experience on this subject were attempted to be collected. Among other discoveries, it was satisfactorily ascertained, that the custom of gratuitous assistance was attended with serious evils. The first step of remove from this was the experiment of giving half and loaning half. The operation of this plan, not only confirmed former impressions of the inexpediency of a system of entire gratuity, but ultimately led to the conviction, that it was unnecessary to bestow gratuitously at all, any farther than to exempt from the obligations of usury; and that in case of misfortune, or of assignment to a peculiarly self-denying field of labor, a dispensing power should be vested in the Directors, to discharge, at their discretion, from all obligation. Such is the basis of the A. E. Society, in this particular, at the present moment. The plan has been in operation several years, with constantly recurring and multiplied proofs, as well from those who have entered the field of labor, as from those in a course of preparation, of the superior advantages of this rule over any former practice, and with the strongest recommendations for its perpetuity. Some of the advantages of this method of proceeding will now be stated.

First, it is obvious, that it is a very great economy of public charity, instituting a process of reversion, by which a provision,

once created, for conducting a young man through a course of education, is made to multiply itself indefinitely, so that a single foundation for a scholarship may educate a constantly increasing number. With all the subtractions for the failure of refunding in special cases, this course must ultimately prove an admirable economy, and not only greatly augment the means of educating suitable candidates for the ministry, but diminish the public calls for this particular design, and give more scope for appropriations to other objects. This will be an indubitable, and, we trust, a happy result.

But unless this course can be proved to have a favorable influence on the *character* of young men, the consideration just named is by no means sufficient to warrant its adoption. And here we do not think it necessary to rely solely on the testimony of experience and observation, as certified by beneficiaries themselves, and by those most conversant with them, although the testimony of this kind is abundant. There is a field of evidence on this point, which is open to every one's observation, and which rests on well-ascertained principles of our nature. We cannot conceive of a course of treatment better calculated to cherish and secure *independence of character* in those who are the proper subjects of charitable education, than that of *loaning money* on the conditions prescribed by the A. E. Society. It is conceded, on all hands, that this feature of manly character is vastly important to be cherished. Let us consider, then, what are the peculiar materials, (for they are peculiar,) on which the principle in question is to operate. We are not consulting for the good of those who have been cradled in affluence, nursed in pampered delicacy, addicted to luxury of living, and hauteur of manners, and bred from the beginning to a pride of independence which spurns all obligation to others. Such, let it be remembered, are not the characters, to which the present system of education is to be adapted. May the church no more be cursed with a ministry of this description. But the class of persons whom it is the appropriate business of Education Societies to bring forward, are, by the very supposition of their indigence, remote from the character above described. There may be occasionally among them one, fallen by misfortune from such circumstances, and so imbued with the grace of God, as to be able cheerfully to adapt himself to the situation in which he is providentially placed. But ordinarily they are men of humble origin, modest pretensions, and unobtrusive claims—men, whom, like the primitive disciples, Christ has called from the fish boat, the plough, or the mechanic's shop, and armed them with a spirit of heavenly daring,—having been inured to hardship by custom, and thus providentially furnished with the most important elements of 'a good soldier of Jesus Christ.' It is to men of this description, that the whole economy of an Education Society should be adapted. Others, though candidates for the minis-

try, have no need of such patronage. And if it is desirable for them to cherish a different spirit, and form a different character, from that which we are now contemplating, the door is open. We doubt, however, as to its promise of superior usefulness.

But it is the peculiar province of Education Societies to bring forward those who would not, and could not, otherwise come, on account of their indigence, and thus to furnish an extra corps of evangelists for the church and for the world. And can there be a question, whether it is better to educate such men in a sober, frugal, business-like way, retaining their habits of industry, economy, and self-reliance? Or, shall they be thrown at once upon pure charity, refined to effeminacy, and so stripped of their manly character and independence? This, we are confident, is the length and breadth of the question.

And now let us apply the course of treatment, adopted by the A. E. Society, to such a character, and see how it will naturally affect his independence. It says to him: 'We have found you hopefully possessed, by nature and grace, of those elements of character, which are befitting a candidate for the Christian ministry. You have signified to us your willingness and desire for this high office; but providentially, the indigence of your circumstances interposes discouraging if not insuperable obstacles to the necessary course of preparation. Satisfied of your worthiness of patronage, we propose to lend you assistance—not so much as to relieve you from exertion, or from a feeling of self-dependence, but just enough to encourage your personal enterprise, and with prudence, frugality and industry, to make it successful. Whatever may have been your former course of life, all experience recommends, that the sedentary habits of students should be frequently and daily relieved by vigorous manual exercise, for the health of their bodies, the strength of their minds, and the general soundness of their physical constitution. We recommend, therefore, that you make these necessary exercises productive, as much as possible, of the means of your support, by devoting yourself, at such times, to agricultural or mechanical occupations, which are not only honorable, but highly commendable in the estimation of the wise and the good, and also satisfactory to conscience, and favorable to virtue and piety. It combines amusement and recreation with usefulness—with an actual product of the necessities and comforts of life. We reasonably suppose that by such means, and with frugal living, (which best becomes a disciple of Christ in any case, but especially a candidate for the holy ministry,) you may furnish to yourself a very considerable portion of your necessary support. And so long as your Christian deportment and diligence shall commend you to esteem and confidence, we are authorised, within certain limits, to loan you money as you may need, to be refunded by you, as may be convenient, after you shall have entered upon your public, offi-

cial labors. And if misfortune should prevent your acquiring the means of repayment, or if Providence should call you to a field of labor, demanding special self-denial or sacrifice, we are authorised to assure you, that a tender regard will be had to such considerations by your patrons, and if the exigency reasonably demands it, the specialty of your case will be held as a fair discharge of your obligation. In this manner, it is understood, that in the whole course of your education, you are relying on your own resources, present or anticipated, and are obsequiously obliged to no individual person or set of men. You are thrown upon your own personal character and enterprise. The loan, which is allowed you, is not properly a charity, but your own personal property, ministered by your patrons, as the public stewards of this sacred fund, on the conditions specified. Your voluntary self-consecration to the work of the ministry is considered as making out a fair title to the peculiar and favorable conditions of the loan. The whole provision is intended to free you from that oppressiveness of anxiety, which characterises common pecuniary obligations, to nourish your self-dependence, and to cast you upon your own resources. And for your own present and future benefit, as well as to enable us to discharge our responsibility to the public, it will become you to husband your affairs with prudence, and report their condition periodically to your patrons.'

Such, we understand, is substantially the relation of the A. E. Society to its beneficiaries, and such the terms of that relation, so far as pecuniary aid and obligations are concerned. And that these terms are as favorable, in their influence on *character*, as could well be devised in the peculiarities of the case, we are fully convinced. And we can hardly doubt that such will be the general impression.

Pure gratuity in the support of young men, is now almost universally admitted to be inexpedient; and those who would still be thought to maintain the doctrine, are compelled to get up a factitious theory, founded on the assumption that it is not a *charity*, but a *legal obligation* on the part of the public, and a legal claim on the part of those educated, as really as the stipulated salaries of public servants;—a very extravagant position, truly, and a doctrine, which, if reduced to practice in the extent to which, if correct, it might fairly be applied, would dissolve society in one of the most important articles of its constitution.

We trust that the wisdom and the happy adaptation of the system of the A. E. Society, in its influence on the character of its young men, have now been made sufficiently manifest, showing that it is eminently calculated to raise up a hardy, industrious, patient and efficient ministry. We may just add—that it is fundamental, in the designs of this Institution, to compel those who receive its aid to a thorough and complete education—the best,

which the Academical and Theological Seminaries of our country afford, and that it scrupulously confines its patronage to those who will consent to such a course.

Another feature of this Institution, worthy of special notice, is its system of *pastoral supervision*. It is made the duty of the Secretary and other Agents of the Society, to visit the academies and colleges, where the young men are situated, as often as practicable, for the purpose of knowing them as thoroughly as possible, of cultivating their piety, advising and exhorting them, and of presenting all possible inducements to excel in learning and personal religion, and of raising their Christian and ministerial qualifications to the highest possible standard. We have had personal opportunity to observe, in several of our Literary and Theological Institutions, that this supervision is of great and salutary influence.

The catholic and generous spirit of the A. E. Society is a trait of peculiar interest, and one which promises effectual usefulness. It stands upon the broad basis of Evangelical Christianity, and excludes no sect from its patronage, that legitimately comes within these limits. It is at this moment extending patronage to young men in the Methodist, the Baptist, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and Congregational denominations. In this particular, it has adapted itself to the enlarged spirit of the age, not heeding the distracting claims of the various standards of Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas, but only asking, 'Are you of Christ?'—We are aware, that sectarian interests are opposed to such an enterprise. But so far as we have observed the operation of extended charitable associations, nothing so effectually checks and limits their success, or so much constrains the spirit, ties up the main arteries, and stagnates the vital currents of a healthful system, as putting on the turban of a sect. *Our doctrine is*: Let particular churches, in their own particular limits, guard their creeds. It is their right. But in regard to large, voluntary associations of Christians, professing 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism,' and who desire to co-operate for the common interests of Evangelical religion, we say, Let them meet together on common ground. And surely, if there be any object that can justify such enlarged enterprise, it is the raising up of a Christian ministry, adequate to the necessities of the world. And we hazard nothing in predicting the increasing purity and enlargement of that church, whose individual members act on these catholic principles.

Of one thing we are fully persuaded, that Christianity can never gain its destined triumph by sectarian influence. A particular church, as an ecclesiastical polity, is incapacitated, from its very structure, for enlarged catholic enterprise. It is too stiff, too unaccommodating, too regardful of self, to march upon the world in the spirit of the present age. Its appropriate province is to maintain, as far as convenient, its own faith and order among its own

adherents. But we regard it as the highest and most sacred duty of individual Christians of *all* sects, to lend their mightiest energies, by voluntary associations, to advance the great interests of a common Christianity.

We regard the specific work of modern Education Societies, as a *leading* influence to the conversion of the world. God is constantly producing, by his Spirit, abundant fit materials for this great work. They are only to be looked up, and formed, and the work is done. An Apostle has said, and the law is an eternal one: 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. But how shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? *And how can they preach except they be sent?*'—Here, then, is the end of the matter, so far as the *argument* is concerned. And, in our opinion, the beginning of the work on which the Christian world is entering—the great and mighty impulse, in its incipient stages, is involved in the design of Education Societies.

ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF RHETORICAL DELIVERY, AS APPLIED IN READING AND SPEAKING. *By Ebenezer Porter, D. D. Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Third Edition. Andover; Flagg & Gould. 1830.

ELOCUTION, as a science, has not in modern times received that attention which its importance demands. While the work of improvement has been prosecuted with zeal and success in other departments of education, little has been accomplished in this. So far as Rhetoric relates to the graces of composition, it has not, indeed, been overlooked. And the success of efforts to elevate the standard of style is manifest in the multiplying specimens of fine writing, with which our literature is enriched.

That such progress is making in the Philosophy of Rhetoric is a subject of sincere gratulation. It is to be regretted, however, that no more has been attained in rhetorical delivery—that art which gives to eloquence its charms and its power. No small part of the labor bestowed in acquiring a classical and commanding style is lost to the speaker, if he is deficient in his manner of delivery. A good speaker, though wanting in literary attainments, has been in every age more acceptable, than one of richer mental resources, whose elocution was defective. People in general are more affected by the *manner* of a discourse, than by the *matter*.

In the golden age of Grecian and Roman literature, no branch was studied with such assiduity and enthusiasm, as the science of elocution. The child who was intended for a public speaker was nursed in the bosom of eloquence, and trained with persevering care by approved masters, till he was thoroughly prepared, in the judgement of his tutors, to risk his reputation at the Forum. If the young orator failed in the proprieties of elocution, public sentiment would not endure his performances, however rich his thoughts, or refined his style. The great Athenian orator, with all his intellectual brilliancy, was hissed from the stage on his first appearance. The power of his mighty genius had never shaken the throne of Macedon, if he had not corrected the habits of a defective elocution. Cicero did not become an orator without being subjected to a rigid and protracted discipline. At the commencement of his career he was chargeable with defects, to remedy which he travelled into Asia, and sought the aid of the most accomplished rhetoricians of the age. See Middleton's *Life of Cicero*.

From the Augustan age till the eighteenth century, the literary world seemed to slumber over the science of rhetoric, as though no advances from the ancient masters were necessary or practicable. As Campbell expresses it, 'The observations and rules transmitted to us from those distinguished names in the learned world, Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, have been, for the most part, only translated by later critics, or put into a modish dress and new arrangement.'

We owe a tribute of respect to the memory of Sheridan, who was among the first to attempt an advance from the Institutes of Quintilian, and summon the English literati to the long neglected subject. With the independence of a Bacon, he ventured to encounter incumbent difficulties, and his acute investigations prepared the way for others to follow up his suggested improvements. The labors of Mr. Walker succeeded, and rendered important service to the science of delivery, chiefly by means of the analysis of vocal tones and inflections, first reduced by him to a system.

The discoveries and labors of Walker were not, however, appreciated, as he had anticipated. Some years after the publication of his *Treatise*, of the popularity of which he had cherished extravagant hopes, he remarks: "The sanguine expectations I had once entertained, that this analysis of the human voice would be received by the learned with avidity and applause, are now over." His pronunciation was extensively adopted, but his theory of inflections was encumbered with such prolixity and obscurity, that the task of reducing it to practice seemed appalling and discouraging to common minds. Even his own pupils persisted in their old method of reading, without, as he says, any reason for it.

The same formidable difficulty, which discouraged the English pupil, has produced a like effect in our own country. The avow-

ed imitators of the disappointed English master have been few ; and some of these have succeeded little better than Hamlet's strutting players in their attempt to imitate humanity. The rhetoricians who have succeeded Walker, as Wright and Knowles, do not seem to have made any important advances towards relieving the subject of its embarrassing perplexities. The recent Treatise by Dr. Rush, on the philosophy of the human voice, though it furnishes an exhibition of patient and minute analysis and acute discrimination, is embarrassed with a nomenclature and multifarious distinctions, which few, we presume, will have courage to encounter.

Our knowledge of Professor [now President] Porter's discriminating taste and judgement on the subject of elocution, and his patient investigation of the system of Walker, prepared us, when his design was first announced, to expect a work, better adapted to the end in view, and more fortunate in its reception, than any thing of the kind previously attempted. Nor have we been disappointed. In passing from the *Elements of Walker* to the *Analysis of Rhetorical Delivery*, we felt a relief, not unlike that of the traveller, when emerging from a shadowy, pathless thicket into an open, cultivated lawn, where he can lay his course with precision, and pursue it with pleasure. After repeated examination, and a two years' observation of the success of Dr. Porter's '*Experiment*,' we are confirmed in the impression, that this work has now fallen into competent hands.

The importance of a correct and impressive elocution to the preacher of the Gospel is so obviously great, that we cannot but feel a lively interest in every effort, designed to awaken public attention to the subject. We have no fellowship with that affected concern for the honor of religion, which regards pulpit eloquence as a 'carnal weapon,' with which the ambassador of Christ has no right to meddle. We have long been sick of that dull monotony, and sluggish manner of delivery, which still pervade too many pulpits. There are a goodly number, indeed, of whom it may be said, that their delivery is tolerable ; but how few are heard, who speak *well*. And to what must these defects be attributed ? Not to any deficiency of vocal organs, or any other physical impediment. The evil must be 'ascribed chiefly to early habits, contracted in schools, and to the want of adequate precepts in books on reading and speaking.' Offensive habits, when once acquired, are not corrected without laborious and persevering effort. And the efforts which will avail in correcting such habits may be essentially aided, by helps such as have been attempted by Walker, and, we think, essentially improved by the author of the *Analysis*. With him we can sincerely say, that 'for the purpose of accomplishing the ends, at which Walker aimed in his *Elements of Elocution*, we have much desired to see a manual for students, free both from the obscurity, and the extreme particularity of his system.'

The work before us is an attempt to furnish such a manual ;—or, in the reserved language of the author—"an *experiment* on a subject envired with difficulty." If the experiment should not succeed to the extent of our anticipations, the failure will not be attributed, as in the case of its predecessor, to prolixity and puzzling particularity. Considering the nature of the subject, less could not have been said ; and what is said, does not appear wanting, either in appropriateness or perspicuity. Some of the articles, we think, would have admitted a more extended illustration ; and we are not alone in the wish that the science of rhetoric may be elucidated and enriched with additional contributions from the respected author of the Analysis. From a remark in the preface to the second edition we are encouraged to expect something farther, from Dr. P. in this department of professional education ; and his labors we hope, may be so appreciated, by those especially whom it is his anxious desire to aid in their preparation to preach the Gospel, that he will have no occasion to say, with the indefatigable Walker,—“I have almost worn out a long life in laborious exertions ; and yet I have had the mortification to find few of my pupils listen to me.”

The plan of the work under review comprehends *Reading, Articulation, Inflection, Accent, Emphasis, Modulation, and Rhetorical Action*. Appended is a selection of exercises, to a part of which a notation is applied, to assist the pupil in the modulation of his voice.

Tones express a language powerfully significant, and it is the inflection of the voice, that gives them significancy. There is nothing very moving in a protracted monotone. To analyze these delicate qualities of elocution requires accurate discrimination. The chapter on this subject contains a series of observations and rules, founded on the repeated analysis of tones and inflections, as they are expressed in easy and animated conversation. Objections have been raised against the application of these principles, on the ground that they serve only to fetter and embarrass the learner. The practical utility of them is therefore doubted.

“The same doubt,” says Dr. P., “may as well be extended to every department of practical knowledge. To think of the rules of syntax, every sentence we speak, or of the rules of orthography and style, every time we take up our pen to write, would indeed be perplexing. The remedy prescribed by common sense in all such cases is, not to discard correct theories, but to make them so familiar, as to govern our practice spontaneously, and without reflection.”

If there are fixed principles of elocution, why does it not devolve on the teacher to explain them ; and when a passage is read well, to give the reason *why* it is read well ? The rules of delivery, we are prepared to believe after an examination of the work before us, are capable of being stated with nearly as much precision, and comprehended with as much ease, as the rules of syntax. That this has not, to a greater extent, been done, must be attributed chiefly to the fact, that the classification of vocal inflections is quite

a modern achievement in education, and was at first rendered too complex to invite extensive application. On this point Dr. Porter remarks :—

“Several years of childhood are particularly devoted to acquire a correct orthography and accentuation; and to promote a knowledge of these and of syntax, rules have been framed with great care. But what valuable directions have our elementary books contained as to the management of the voice in reading?—an art which lies at the bottom of all good delivery. Here our embryo orators, on their way to the bar, the senate, and the pulpit, are turned off with a few meagre rules, and are expected to become accomplished speakers, without having ever learned to read a common passage, in a graceful and impressive manner. Fifty years ago, the general direction given by teachers in reading was, that in every sort of sentence, the voice should be kept up in a rising tone till the regular cadence is formed, at the close. This was exactly adapted to ruin all variety and force, and to produce a set of reading tones completely at variance with those of conversation and speaking. The more particular directions as to voice, formerly given in books for learners, are the three following: that a parenthesis requires a quick and weak pronunciation;—that the voice should rise at the end of an interrogative sentence,—and fall at the end of one that is declarative. The first is true without exception;—the second, only in that sort of question which is answered by *yes* or *no*; and the third is true with the exception of all cases where emphasis carries the voice to a high note at the close of a sentence. So that, among the endless variety of modification which the voice assumes in speaking, but one was accurately marked before the time of Walker.”

The absolute modifications of the voice are reduced by our author to four, namely, monotone, rising inflection, falling inflection, and circumflex inflection. Besides the absolute, there are what are denominated relative modifications of the voice,—as *pitch*, *quantity*, *rate*, and *quality*, which come under the article on modulation. After some strictures on the classification of inflections, adopted by preceding writers, Dr. P. makes the following observations respecting the one which he has adopted.

“In order to render the new classification which I have given intelligible, I have chosen examples chiefly from colloquial language: because the tones of conversation ought to be the basis of delivery, and because these only are at once recognised by the ear. Being conformed to nature, they are instinctively right; so that scarcely a man in a million uses artificial tones in conversation. And this one fact, I remark in passing, furnishes a standing canon to the learner in elocution. In contending with any bad habit of voice, let him break up the sentence on which the difficulty occurs, and throw it, if possible, into the colloquial form. Let him observe in himself and others, the turns of voice which occur in speaking familiarly and earnestly on common occasions. Good taste will then enable him to transfer to public delivery the same turns of voice, adapting them, as he must of necessity, to the elevation of his subject.”

The “standing canon,” noticed in the above passage, is worthy of special remark. Governed by this, our author succeeded in reducing this hitherto complicated subject to a form at once so tangible and simple, that those of moderate resolution need not hesitate in attempting to practise it. The rules given are few, brief, and perspicuous; and may be readily comprehended, and easily retained. The examples introduced to illustrate the application of these rules appear to have been selected with care and judgement. As a specimen take the second rule :—

"The direct question, or that which admits the answer of yes or no, has the rising inflection, and the answer has the falling :—"

EXAMPLE. "Are they Hebrews? So am I—Are they Israelites? So am I—Are they ministers of Christ? I am more."

Were this passage read so as to give the rising inflection to the several answers, it would destroy that gravity and authority, with which it would doubtless have been uttered by the apostle.

In a subsequent rule, the following position is assumed ;

"The indirect question, or that which is not answered by yes or no, has the falling inflection ; and its answer has the same :—"

'Who say the people that I am? They answering, said, John the Baptist ; but some say Elias ; and others say, that one of the old prophets is risen.'"

The characteristic difference between the rising and falling inflection, so far as emotion is concerned, is, that the former is expressive of the tender, and pathetic ; as grief, lamentation, compassion, affection, and devotional reverence. The Lamentations of Jeremiah, and various other portions of the Scriptures, abound in passages, which require that plaintive utterance, in which the rising inflection may be distinctly perceived. The falling inflection more generally is expressive of decision, force, authority, denunciation, bold and strong passion.

EXAMPLES. "Go to the ant, thou sluggard : consider her ways, and be wise. His lord answered and said unto him, thou wicked and slothful servant,—thou knowest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strewed. Let that day be darkness ; let not God regard it from above, neither let the light shine upon it ; let darkness and the shadow of death stain it ; let a cloud dwell upon it ; let the blackness of the day terrify it."

Though the *analysis* of vocal inflections is a recent thing, yet it has been understood from the days of Pericles, that the voice was susceptible of various and significant inflections, and that good delivery required them to be skilfully managed. The correct ear could determine, when delivery was good ; but the *rationale* was a mystery, which none could explain. Quintilian, in his directions on the subject of delivery, did not overlook the fact, that there were vocal inflections, though he did not analyse them. *Dicamus ut in iisdem partibus, iisdemque affectibus, sint quædam non ita magnæ vocis declinationes prout aut verborum dignitas, aut sententiarum natura, aut dispositio, aut exceptio, aut transitus postulat.* *Quinct. Lib. xi. c. 3.* When the voice is judiciously managed, delivery, to use the language of Fenelon, "is a kind of music, whose beauty consists in the variety of proper tones and inflections, which ought to rise or fall with a just and easy cadence, according to the nature of the things we express. It gives a light, as well as a grace, to language ; and is the very life and spirit of discourse."

The chapter on tones and inflections, as a whole, is well executed. The results are those of actual experiment and observation and not of hypothesis. The philosophy of inflections lies at the foundation of correct elocution, and every public speaker would derive important advantage from a thorough knowledge of the

subject. Nor is this the dry and arduous task which many may have supposed, especially as it is presented by Dr. Porter. What Walker has spread over one hundred and fifty pages, he has brought into less than twenty, and yet has retained most that is valuable in the work of his predecessor, with the addition of some original matter. Though he was not the first to apprehend and bind 'that varying Proteus of the speaking voice,' to him belongs the credit of narrowing its limits, so that it is no longer difficult to approach and master it. And after chasing this flitting truant for years to little purpose, we feel greatly obliged to the man, who has thus given us the means of apprehending it and retaining it in our service.

Another elementary article, belonging to the subject of rhetorical delivery, is the correct adjustment of *emphatic stress*. In animated conversation this stress is correctly laid, even by a little child, and it is so laid, because feeling is awakened—there is *emotion*. On this subject we recur with pleasure to the pertinent observations of our author.

"Emphasis is governed by the laws of sentiment, being inseparably connected with thought and emotion. It is the most important principle, by which elocution is related to the operation of mind. Hence when it stands opposed to the claims of custom or of harmony, these always give way to its supremacy. The *accent* which custom attaches to a word, emphasis may supersede. Custom requires a *cadence* at the final pause; but emphasis often turns the voice *upward* at the end of a sentence; as,

You were paid to *fight* against Alexander, not to *rail* at him.

Harmony requires the *voice to rise at the pause before the cadence*; whereas emphasis sometimes prescribes the falling slide at this pause, to enforce the sense; as,

Better to reign in *hell*, than serve in *heaven*.

"Now I presume that every one, who is at all accustomed to accurate observation on this subject, must be sensible how very little this grand principle is regarded in forming our earliest habits of elocution; and therefore how hopeless are all efforts to correct what is wrong in these habits, without a just knowledge of emphasis.

"What then is emphasis? Without staying to assign reasons why I am dissatisfied with definitions heretofore given, by respectable writers, the following is offered as more complete in my opinion, than others which I have seen. *Emphasis is a distinctive utterance of words, which are especially significant, with such a degree and kind of stress, as conveys their meaning in the best manner.*"

This subject of emphasis is disposed of under two simple divisions, namely, *emphatic stress* and *emphatic inflection*.

More particularity in enumerating the faults that obtain in laying emphasis, would to some have been an acceptable service. We have noticed a variety of such faults, some of which render delivery harsh and unnatural, almost past endurance. 'The abrupt, jerking emphasis' is common. We have heard the periodic stress, laid at regular intervals, as if designed to prevent monotony. Not unfrequently the speaker lets it fall on a little word, which has no claims to promineney, and 'in monosyllables his thunders roll.'

There is occasionally heard the drawling, trilling, twanging, emphasis, which serves rather to 'tear a passion to tatters,' than give force and effect to delivery. Not unfrequently are the rights of emphasis sacrificed to metrical accent, as in couplets like the following :

Show pity, Lord ; O Lord, forgive ;
Let *a* repenting rebel live.

There are passages, however, in which small words, even particles, require the force of emphasis. Examples are introduced and illustrated by our author.

"In the narrative of Paul's voyage from Troas to Jerusalem, it is said, 'Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus.' This sentence, with a moderate stress on Ephesus, implies that the Apostle meant to stop there ; just as a common phrase, 'The ship is going to Holland by Liverpool,'—implies that she will touch at the latter place.

"Now what was the fact in the case of Paul ? The historian says, 'He hasted to be at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost.' Therefore he could not afford the time it would require to visit his dear friends, the Ephesian church, and he chose to pursue his voyage without seeing them. But can the words be made to express this sense ? Perfectly ; and that with only an increase of stress on one particle. 'Paul had determined to sail *by* Ephesus.'

"Another example shows us a succession of small words raised to importance by becoming peculiarly significant. In Shakspeare's Merchant of Venice, Bassanio had received a ring from his wife, with the strongest protestations that it should never part from his finger ; but, in a moment of generous gratitude for the preservation of his friend's life, he forgot this promise, and gave the ring to the officer to whose kind interposition he ascribed that deliverance. With great mortification at the act, he afterwards made the following apology to his wife, an unemphatic pronounciation of which leaves it scarcely intelligible ; while distinct emphasis on a few small words gives it precision and vivacity, thus :

If you did know *to* whom I gave the ring,
If you did know *for* whom I gave the ring,
And would conceive for *what* I gave the ring,
And how *unwillingly* I left the ring,
When nought would be accepted *but* the ring,
You would abate the strength of your displeasure.

"In the case that follows, too, we see how the meaning of a sentence often depends on the manner in which we utter one short word : 'One of the servants of the high priest, (being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off,) saith, did not I see thee in the garden with him ?' Now if we utter this, as most readers do, with a stress on *kinsman*, and a short pause after it, we make the sentence affirm that the man whose ear Peter cut off was kinsman to the high priest, which was not the fact. But a stress upon *his*, makes this servant kinsman to another man, who received the wound."

A fundamental position of Walker is, that *emphasis* always implies *antithesis* ; and that emphatic stress is never to be given to a word, unless it stands opposed to something in sense, that is either expressed or implied. Others have acquiesced in this decision. Dr. P. has contested it, exposed the fallacy of the reasons urged in its support, and shown, as we think, that there is *absolute* emphasis.

"The principle assumed," he says, "cannot be admitted ; for to say that there is no absolute emphasis, is to say that a thought is never important, considered of *itself* ; or that the figure of *contrast* is the only way in which a thought can be

expressed with force. The theory which supposes this, is too narrow to correspond with the philosophy of elocution. There are other sources, besides antithetic relation, from which the mind receives strong and vivid impressions, which it is the office of vocal language to express."

Examples of absolute emphasis abound, such as the following :—

*Up ! comrades,—up !—
Charge, Chester, charge ! On, Stanley, on !—
Wo unto you, Pharisees !—
Angels ! and ministers of grace,—defend us.*

That antithesis constitutes the more frequent occasion for emphatic stress is doubtless the fact. This appears in such passages as the following :—

The *manner* of speaking is as important as the *matter*.
Study not so much to *show* knowledge, as to *acquire* it.
It is not so difficult to *talk* well, as to *live* well.

Our author has treated the subject of *emphatic inflection* with his usual acuteness and discrimination. 'Strong emphasis,' he observes, 'demands in all cases an appropriate inflection ; and to change this inflection perverts the sense.' The question which here meets us is, how may it be ascertained which inflection an emphatic word requires ? In illustrating this point, Dr. P. has again departed from Walker, who has devoted twenty pages to explain what he calls the 'grand distinction,' and leaves it still involved in obscurity. Having stated his reasons for dissenting from his predecessor, he gives us his own views.

"The plain distinction between the rising and the falling emphasis, when antithetic relation is expressed or suggested, is, the falling denotes *positive* affirmation or enunciation of a thought with energy ; the rising either expresses *negation*, or *qualified* and *conditional* affirmation. In the latter case, the antithetic object, if there is one, may be suggested *ironically*, or *hypothetically*, or *comparatively*."

This position is amply illustrated by apposite examples and explanations, and concluded as follows :—

"The amount is, that generally the weaker emphasis, where there is tender, or conditional, or partial enunciation of thought, requires the voice to *rise* : while the strong emphasis, where the thought is bold, and the language positive, adopts the falling slide, except where some counteracting principle occurs, as in the interrogative inflection just mentioned. Emphatic inflection varies according to those general laws of the voice which I have endeavored to describe at some length. For these varieties we may assign good reasons, in some cases ; while in others we must stop with the fact, that such are the settled usages of elocution ; and in others still, we can only say, such are the instinctive principles of vocal intonation. In all such cases, explanation becomes obscurity, if carried out of its proper limits. Beyond these, I can no more tell why sorrow or supplication incline the voice to the rising slide, while indignation or command incline it to the falling, than I can tell why one emotion flashes in the eye, and another vents itself in tears."

In concluding our remarks on emphasis, we intended to have said something on what Dr. Rush calls *guttural* emphasis, which is not noticed in the work before us. But the cases are so rare

in which it can be used, without the appearance of affectation, especially in grave delivery, that we shall be excused in passing it over in silence. It is a species of stress, employed in the histrionic school, when scorn, indignant authority, sullen despair, &c. are expressed with convulsive emotion.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEOUS.

SHALL I SEND MY SON TO HARVARD COLLEGE?

DEAR SIR,

The question proposed in your last is one of great interest to yourself and family, and though considerations of a personal nature might prompt me to be silent, I could never excuse myself, should I refuse or neglect, on such grounds, to express to you my real sentiments.

"My son ——." you say, "will be prepared, in a few months for College. Where shall I send him? You know my partialities for Harvard, and were it not for the Unitarianism prevailing in that seminary, I should not hesitate. But are there no circumstances which render it more safe than formerly for the children of Orthodox parents to be educated there? You are in the vicinity, and better acquainted with the state of things than I am. Will you have the goodness to drop me a line on the subject?"

I could drop you a line, my dear Sir, with little trouble; but a line would not answer *your* purpose, nor satisfy *my* conscience. If I write anything, I must go into the subject, and endeavor to place it before you, as it presents itself to me; and if you have not time or patience to plod through a long letter, you had better stop where you are, and 'do what seemeth right in your own eyes.'

It is natural that you should feel a partiality for Harvard, as one of the most ancient and best endowed institutions in our country, and especially as the place of your own education. There are many who feel the same partiality, especially in this region, and whom nothing but the force of conscience and the fear of God could have induced to withdraw from it their countenance and patronage. You are apprized, it appears, of the Unitarian character of the institution, but seem to flatter yourself that some circumstances have recently taken place, 'which render it more safe than formerly for the children of Orthodox parents to be educated there.' I know not to what particular circumstances you allude. Sure I am, that nothing has come to my knowledge, which goes to remedy, or scarcely to modify, the previous religious character of the College. An honorary degree was indeed conferred on an Orthodox clergyman a year or two ago; another such clergyman has recently delivered the Dudleian Lecture; and two or three others have been appointed on committees of visitation and examination. Provision has also been made, by which students, at the request of their parents, can be permitted

to attend public worship out of the chapel. Circumstances such as these I do not overlook, or undervalue. As indications of diminished exclusiveness, of budding liberality, of a disposition to treat the Orthodox with some small degree of attention, they are deserving of notice. But how far, my dear Sir, do they go, towards changing or even modifying the fixed and all pervading Unitarian character of this Institution? The Corporation and the Overseers (so far as they are elective) are still, with scarcely an exception, Unitarian. The officers of instruction and government, from the highest to the lowest, are understood to be Unitarian.* Whatever religious instruction is afforded by the Professors will be, of course, Unitarian. A great majority of the students, and the whole current of influence proceeding from them, will be found on the side of Unitarianism. A strong corps of resident graduates, especially those in the Divinity School, will exert their influence on the same side. Periodicals, tracts and books, inculcating the favorite doctrine, are freely circulating and with high recommendations. Indeed, the *esprit du corps*, the pervading spirit, which has more influence in such an institution than anything else, is altogether in favor of this doctrine, so that Harvard College still is (what it has been denominated by its partizans in years past) 'the pure, uncorrupted fountain head of Unitarianism.'

Shall I advise you, then, to place your son—the child of your prayers and fondest hopes, whom you early dedicated to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and whom you are endeavoring to prepare for usefulness in the kingdom of Christ—shall I advise you to place him, during the four most critical years of his existence, at this Unitarian institution? No, my dear Sir, I cannot do it;—and for the following reasons:—

In the first place, you have no right to place your child in a scene of such extreme moral and spiritual danger. Under the most favorable circumstances, a Collegiate course is a morally hazardous one, so much so, that no Christian parent, who understands the subject, can enter his son upon it without deep solicitude. What, then, must this course be, under circumstances, I was about to say, the most unfavorable?

You will be told, perhaps, that no very definite religious instruction is attempted to be given to the under-graduates at Harvard. And suppose this is true. What other objection to such an institution would the *Christian* parent need? Ought there not to be definite religious instruction? Ought the young, susceptible, forming mind to be left four years without religious instruction? Ought the deceitful heart to remain so long uncultivated, and the weeds of sin be suffered to grow unrestrained?

I presume there are no very open, direct means used by the officers with the children of Orthodox parents, to convert them to the Unitarian faith. Such means, if resorted to, would defeat themselves. They would excite suspicion, create repellency, and bar the heart of the pupil against further efforts. Palpable persuasions

* A young gentleman, at present a tutor, ought, perhaps, to be excepted.

need not be employed. A current of influence, too strong ordinarily for youthful energy to resist, can easily be put in motion without them. Suppose your son should to-day become a member of Harvard College. He could not be there a week, without discovering what kind of religion was fashionable, was popular, and what religion he must embrace, if he intended to secure general approbation. He would see where the multitude of his companions thronged, and where his instructors led the way; and the respect which you would wish him to accord to his instructors would be easily transferred to the principles which they professed. He would see what preachers were admired, and what hated; who were spoken of as men of enlarged and liberal views, and who denounced as stupid, ignorant, and bigoted. He would soon find, that he must break loose from some of the restraints of his education, must visit his closet less frequently, keep the Sabbath less strictly, lay aside his devotional books, and regard the institutions of religion with less seriousness and reverence, or he must become, at least to many, an object of suspicion, if not of scorn. He may indeed be permitted, at your request, to attend an Orthodox meeting; but this very circumstance would separate him from his companions, expose him to an odious name, and identify him with a hated sect; and unless blessed with more purity of principle, more strength of character, than falls to the lot of some young men, he might not long be willing to gratify you in this respect, but would prefer to remove suspicion, and restore himself to favor, by sitting down quietly under the Unitarian droppings of the Chapel. In short, he would first be ashamed of his orthodoxy, and then, probably, renounce it; and you would ere long hear from others, if not from him, that he had learned to trifle with the great and precious doctrines of the Gospel.

That I do not exaggerate the dangers of a four years' residence at Harvard College will be evident from the following account, published two years ago in Philadelphia, by a young gentleman who had experienced them.

"The most able description can convey but a very imperfect impression of the thousand influences which are there brought to bear upon the heart of every student, to chill his piety, to weaken the hold which the great truths of the gospel may have had upon him, to induce him to look upon the scriptures (except in name) with a skeptical mind, and some portions of them with a sneering infidelity. And all this is effected in the bosom of the incautious youth almost imperceptibly. Whilst the poison of error is insinuating itself into his mind, and the sleep of spiritual death is coming over him, his ears are charmed, and his fears lulled, by the captivating notes of *charity, liberality, the improvements of the age*, and the requiem that is forever sung over *creeds and confessions, bigotry and superstition!*

"Since 1805, the time of the election of Dr. Ware to the Professorship of Divinity, few young men, even of the most devout and faithful parents, have been able to recover from the shock which their early religious education there sustained: A melancholy interval, when surveyed in its results by the eye of Christian benevolence, during which Unitarianism has engulfed in its dark flood nearly all the sons of Harvard. Within a few years past however, several, after having made shipwreck of their faith at Harvard, have been restored. I am personally acquainted with a number of this description, who look back upon dangers escaped with amazement, and upward with overflowing gratitude to the Eternal Spirit as their deliverer.

"This I consider myself bound to testify before the world, *that the influence there exerted against sound religious sentiments and vital godliness, is like a sweeping flood; to the unfortified minds of youth it is resistless.* I am acquainted with no situation, where, in my view, (and I speak from sad experience,) a principle of evangelical piety, and faith in the doctrines of the cross, would be less likely to be obtained, or, if possessed, would be placed in circumstances of greater peril."

Since the publication of this solemn testimony, I know of no diminution of spiritual dangers at the University, nor indeed of any considerable change for the better. A fuller developement of Unitarian principles has since been made, showing that they go to a denial—not only of most of the doctrines of the Bible, as those of depravity, atonement, regeneration, justification by faith, and *eternal punishment*,*—but of the *inspiration of the Bible itself*.†

My next reason for the advice here given relates rather to yourself, than to your son. You have repeatedly and publicly expressed your dissent from the religion inculcated by modern Unitarians. You have represented their system as defective and dangerous, and justified those who have come out and separated themselves from it. Now suppose, after all this, you send your son to be educated at Harvard College, and place him under the immediate direction and influence of Unitarian instructors. What use, think you, would be made of such a procedure? Would it not be said at once, 'See how much in earnest Mr. ——— is, in the censures which he passes upon Unitarianism. He does not think so unfavorably of our religion, after all. If he really believed our views to be essentially wrong, and of dangerous influence, would he entrust us with the education of his son? Would he place his own child under our direction and care, and commit to us the formation of his mind, if he seriously regarded us as in fatal error? Impossible! These Orthodox pretenders may say what they please. Their actions are inconsistent with their declarations, and render them unworthy of regard.'—I well know, my dear Sir, what has been said in similar cases; and I know as well what would be said, and said with no little show of reason, should you decide to place your son at Harvard. You must expect, as the result of such a measure, not only to have your sincerity and consistency impeached, but to have your influence, in favor of truth and in opposition to prevailing errors, materially obstructed.

Allow me further to inquire whether, by extending patronage to Harvard College as it now stands, you do not countenance the *perversions*, the *injustice*, by which it has been brought to its present state.—I need not inform you, that it is by a gross perversion of funds that Unitarianism has predominated in Harvard College—that the Hollis Professor of Divinity first obtained and still holds his responsible office. It was provided and ordered by Mr. Hollis, that his professor should be a man "of sound or *orthodox principles*,"

* The conductors of the *Christian Examiner* inform us, that they look upon 'the Calvinistic doctrine of hell torments,' as 'beyond all question, *the most horrible dogma ever conceived or uttered by man.*' Number for May, 1830. p. 202.

† See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. iii. pp. 13—15 and 95—101.

and a solemn promise was given him that his orders should be obeyed. It was further provided by Deacon Hinchman, who made an addition to the Hollis fund, that the Professor should "teach the principles of the Christian religion, according to the well known Confession of faith drawn up by the synod of the churches of New England." But is Dr. Ware a man "of orthodox principles," according to the views of the Calvinistic Hollis? Does he "teach the principles of the Christian religion, according to the New England Confession of faith?" Nobody can with the least reason pretend it. Why then does he receive the avails of these funds? Why is the faith plighted to the holy dead thus wantonly disregarded? Why are such perversions endured?—But I need not say these things to *you*, who are well acquainted with the facts, and who regard them as I do. The proper questions are, Does not every man, who patronizes Harvard College (as it now is) by placing his children there for education, give a sort of countenance to these perversions? Is it not so understood by those immediately concerned? Is it not because they have felt encouraged by such countenance, that these perversions have been persisted in? And can you, Sir, or can any one who views the subject as you do, encourage and countenance them in this way?

It may be urged, again, that the *permanent good of Harvard College* requires, that the Orthodox community should for the present stand aloof from it, and withhold their patronage.—We are accused of indulging hostility towards this ancient seminary—of pursuing it with a relentless persecution—of striving to curtail its influence, cut off its resources, and effect its overthrow. Perhaps this very letter, should you make it public, will be adduced as evidence of such a disposition. But our feelings, with those of thousands of our brethren, bear witness to the injustice of these accusations. So far from hostility, there is a strong and general partiality among the Orthodox of Massachusetts for this venerable institution. They cannot forget the high and holy purpose for which it was founded; the great good which, in former years, it has accomplished; and the many excellent men (now in heaven) to whom it has been an object of deep solicitude, and earnest prayer. Their warm affections still cluster around it; and though compelled, by its present infected moral atmosphere for a time to withdraw, they are waiting the hour when this shall be blown away by the pure breath of heaven, and when they can with safety return.

We are well satisfied that Harvard College cannot rise and prosper, as it now is. There must ultimately be a change. We do not claim that it shall become exclusively Orthodox, or wish that it may fall under the entire influence of any one denomination. Unlike those institutions which have been founded by different sects for their own particular use and benefit, Harvard College is in *right*, and ought to be in *fact*, the COLLEGE OF THE STATE, where all the religious denominations may have an influence, and to which all may send their children without the danger of their being perverted. Not only is a change of this nature just and proper, it is *absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the institution*. But how shall such a

change be effected ? The Unitarians, a sect of recent origin, which has crept in upon us by concealment and artifice, and which constitutes but a small part of the whole Commonwealth, have so managed as to obtain exclusive possession of the College, and have so modified its original, legal constitution as to feel secure beyond the possibility of change. The institution is now in their hands, and doubtless they intend it shall be. In these circumstances, what course does it become the tried and best friends of the College to pursue ? What measures will an *enlightened and extended regard for THE GOOD of the institution* incline them to adopt ? I reply, without hesitation, Let them withdraw. Let them, for the time, withhold their patronage, and send their scholars to other seminaries. Not only do their principles, and the spiritual safety of their children, require this procedure,—the *best good of Harvard College requires the same*. By such a course, entered on and persisted in, the eyes of those who now direct the affairs of College may at length be opened. The question will, at least, be submitted to them, whether Harvard College shall be in *fact*, what it is in *right*, and what from the first it was designed to be, the *University of Massachusetts*, doubling and trebling its present number of students, collecting them from all the different denominations, and enjoying the confidence and support of all ; or whether it shall continue as it now is, a *Unitarian, sectarian College*,—lauded and supported by a few, but by the great body of the people suspected and shunned, destined to see other much younger establishments towering above it, and leaving it, in point of numbers and influence, a second or third rate institution. This is the question which the different denominations in our country (the Unitarians excepted) have it in their power to put to the present Curators and Governors of Harvard College, and which, in my judgement, ought to be put to them, very distinctly, and without delay. Nothing will so directly tend to open their eyes, bring them to a sense of their duty and interest, and hasten the change for which we are all waiting, and without which the institution cannot rise and prosper, as this. But in order to the full success of a measure of this kind, the excluded denominations must be of one mind on the subject, and must consent for a time, (though some may be called to make a sacrifice) to stand aloof from the perverted institution, and educate their children at other seminaries.

Nor can Unitarians consistently complain of such a procedure. Is it not enough that they have taken possession of the College, instituted and endowed for the benefit of the whole State, excluded the other denominations from any share in its government, and are using it for the furtherance of their sectarian views ?* Must the excluded denominations now come forward and help them support it ? Must they consent to give up their children to be educated in it, and there to be moulded into a belief of Unitarianism ? If Uni-

* In support of this last assertion, it may be stated, that the (Unitarian) Divinity school in Cambridge is instructed almost solely by the University Professors, Ware, Willard, Norton, and Follen, who receive their compensation chiefly (some of them entirely) from the College funds. See Unitarian Tract, No. 32, pp. 19, 20.

tarians expect the countenance and patronage of other denominations, then let them give them a due share in the government of the institution. Or if they are resolved that Harvard College shall retain its sectarian character, and continue, what it now is—'the pure, uncorrupted fountain head of Unitarianism;' then let them expect to support it themselves. The most, certainly, which they ought to expect of the excluded denominations is, that they will quietly withdraw, and give their support to institutions of a different character.

You are aware, doubtless, that the views expressed in this letter are not new. They have been entertained and acted on by the majority of Evangelical Christians for several years. And this fact suggests another reason why *all* should unite in them. All must unite, in order to impress more deeply the necessity of a change, and to induce those who have the direction of College to restore it to its original destination with the least possible delay. In these circumstances, therefore, for dissatisfied individuals (like yourself) to continue their patronage, is not only to protract the evils of which you complain, but is practising a sort of injustice upon those brethren who, from motives of conscience, have already withdrawn. It is placing the restoration of their privileges at a needless distance. It is shutting them out (perhaps at great personal sacrifices) from the benefits of Harvard College, longer than would otherwise be necessary. At the same time, it is fastening a disease upon the institution itself, under which it may long languish, but can never rise, and flourish, and prosper.

And perhaps this last consideration, to which I again recur, ought to have more influence with us than any other;—*an enlightened and extended regard for the prosperity and usefulness of Harvard College*. Notwithstanding all the perversions and evils it has suffered, we still love and honor this venerable seminary. We remember what it has been—we know what it might be—and with sadness we are constrained to see what it is. In the increase of population, wealth, and public education, why has the number of its under-graduates, for the last several years, been rather diminishing than increasing? Why are other institutions, less ancient, less favorably situated, less liberally endowed, outstripping it and going beyond it in this respect? Why are some, of but a few years' growth, already treading on its heels, and threatening soon to pass beyond it. Fast by the Capital—the centre of influence—in a State which educates more scholars than any other in the Union, why does it receive but a small part of them?—It is clear, my dear Sir, that there is a *disease* upon this institution—which, unless removed, must greatly impair, if not destroy it. Those who alone have the means of applying a remedy begin to be sensible of this; but it is necessary that they feel it more and more. They have already administered some little palliatives, but nothing which goes to the seat of the difficulty, or renders it safe for those who would avoid infection to place their children within its walls. The best which you, and I, and the great body of Evangelical Christians of all denominations can at present do for it, is to leave it. We will not forget it in our

supplications—we will stand ready to do anything for it which can be done, without pampering the disease which is destroying it—and when the existing experiment of folly shall have been fully tried, the reign of Unitarian exclusiveness shall have come to an end, the College shall be restored to its original destination, and be placed in a situation in which it can be *safely* patronized—in which it *ought* to rise and prosper ; then we will show our attachment to it, by contributing our influence, with the thousands of our brethren, to make it the glory of our land.

Pardon me, my dear Sir, if, by the length of these remarks, I have put your patience to too severe a trial. I have written freely, and in as few words as I could, consistently with my sense of the importance of the subject. I have expressed not only my own views, but those of several judicious friends, whom I have taken the liberty to consult on this occasion. You will bear in mind the great importance of the question which you are about to decide—will endeavor to view it in all its bearings—will carry it often to the throne of grace—and will thus be enabled, I doubt not, to come to that conclusion, which will be most for your own comfort, and that of your family, and for the honor and interest of the Redeemer's kingdom.

With much affection yours, &c.

CHAUNCY.

NATURAL HISTORY OF ENTHUSIASM.

In our last, we published a Review of the "Natural History of Enthusiasm." Our limits did not permit us to give all the extracts which we intended. We now add the following, as deserving the attention of our readers.

The Doctrine of Divine Influences consistent with the Use of Means.

"If it be true that the agency of the Holy Spirit in renovating the heart is perfectly congruous with the natural movements of the mind, both in its animal and intellectual constitution, it is implied that whatever natural means of suasion, or of rational conviction, are proper to rectify the motives of mankind, will be employed as the concomitant, or second causes of the change. These exterior means of amendment are, in fact, only certain parts of the entire machinery of human nature ; nor can it be believed that its Author holds in light esteem His own wisdom of contrivance ; or is at any time obliged to break up or condemn the mechanism which He has pronounced to be "very good."

Two causes seem to have operated in maintaining the notion that divine influence is dissociated from concurrent means of suasion :—The first of these is an ill-judged but excusable jealousy on the part of pious persons for the honor of sovereign grace ; and is a mere reaction upon orthodoxy from the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian heresies. Such persons have thought it necessary, for the safety of a most important doctrine, not merely to assert the supremacy of the ultimate

agent; but to disparage, as much as possible, the intermediate agency. The second of these causes is the imaginary difficulty felt by those who, having unadvisedly plunged into the depths of metaphysical theology, when they should have busied themselves only with the plain things of religion, cannot adjust their notions of divine aid and human responsibility; and, therefore, if they would be zealous for the honor due to the first, think themselves obliged almost to nullify the second. If any such difficulty actually exists, it should be made to rest upon the operations of nature, where it meets us not less than in the precincts of theology; and the husbandman should desist from his toils, until schoolmen have demonstrated to him the *rationalité* of the combined operations of first and second causes. Or if such a demonstration must not be waited for, and if the husbandman is to commit the precious grain to the earth, and to use all his skill and industry in favoring the inscrutable process of nature, then let the theologian pursue a parallel course, satisfied to know that while the Scriptures affirm in the clearest terms whatever may enhance our ideas of the necessity and sovereignty of divine grace, they nowhere give intimation of a suspended or a halved responsibility on the part of man; but, on the contrary, use without scruple, language which implies that the spiritual welfare of those who are taught, depends on the zeal and labors of the teacher, as truly as the temporal welfare of children depends on the industry of a father. The practical consequences of such speculative confusions are seen in the frightful apathy and culpable negligence of some instructors and parents, who, because a metaphysical problem which ought never to have been heard of beyond the walls of colleges, obstructs their understandings, have acquired the habit of gazing with indifference upon the profaneness and immoralities of those whom their diligence might have retained in the path of piety and virtue.

Evangelical Christians improperly called Enthusiasts.

All who are not wilfully ignorant must know that what is vulgarly called "the religious world," now includes, not only myriads of the lower, and middle, and imperfectly educated classes, in relation to whom self-complacent arrogance may easily find pretext of scorn;—and not only many of the opulent and the noble; but a fair proportion also of all the talent, and learning, and brilliancy of mind, that adorns the professional circles, and that vivifies the literature of the country. What appropriateness is then left to language, if a phrase of supercilious import is to be attached to the names of men of vigorous understanding, and energetic character, and eminent acquirement;—of men, successful in their several courses, and accomplished in whatever gives grace to human nature? When those, who are in no assignable good quality inferior to their competitors on the arena of life are, on account of their religious opinions and practices, called Enthusiasts, is it not evident that nothing is actually effected but the annulling of the contumelious power of the term so misused? We may indeed in this manner neutralize the significance of a word; but we cannot slur the fair fame of those upon whom so absurdly we have flung it.

That this infatuation should, in any great number of instances, be

dispelled by mere shewing of reasons, is what the religionist, the enthusiasts, are by no means so enthusiastical as to expect:—they too well understand the nature of the malady, and too well know its inveteracy, to imagine that it may be dissipated by argument, even though the cause were in the hands of a college of dialecticians. And yet, though they entertain no such expectation as this, they—the religionists—do very generally, and with some degree of confidence, entertain the belief that, ere very long, the error of irreligion will be seen universally, and that Christianity, or, for the sake of distinctness, let it be said the religion of the Reformation, the religion of Wickliffe, and Latimer, and Cranmer, and Jewel, and Hooker, and Owen, and Howe, and Baxter, will gain unquestioned ascendancy—will bear down infidelity and heresy, and absorb schism, and possess itself of Christendom;—and of the family of man.

The Power of Christianity.

The early triumph of the Gospel over the fascinating idolatries and the astute atheism of Greece and Rome, has been often (and conclusively) insisted upon, as evidence of its truth. With that argument we have nothing now to do; but if the subject were not a very hackneyed one, it might well be urged, in all its details, in proof of a different point—namely, the innate power of the religion of the Bible to vanquish the hearts of men. An opponent may choose his alternative; either let him grant that Christianity triumphed because it was true and divine; or let him deny that it had any aid from heaven. In the former case, we shall be entitled to infer that the religion of God must at length universally prevail; or in the latter, strongly argue that this doctrine possesses almost an omnipotence of intrinsic force, by which it obtained success under circumstances of opposition, such as made its triumph seem, even to its enemies, miraculous.

It is natural to look to the next occasion in which the opinions of mankind were put in fermentation, and to watch in what manner the system of the Bible rode over the high billows of political, religious, and intellectual commotion. It was a fair trial for Christianity, and a trial essentially different from its first, when, in the fifteenth century, after having been corrupted in every part to a state of loathsome ulceration, it had to contend for existence, and to work its own renovation, at the moment of the most extraordinary expansion of the human intellect that has ever happened. At that moment, when the splendid literature of the ancient world started from its tomb, and kindled a blaze of universal admiration; at that moment, when the first beams of sound philosophy broke over the nations; and when the revival of the useful arts gave at once elasticity to the minds of the million, and a check of practical influence to the minds of the few; at the moment when the necromancy of the press came into play, to expose and explode necromancy of every other kind; and when the discovery of new continents, and of a new path to the old, tended to supplant a taste for whatever is visionary, by imparting a vivid taste for what is substantial; at such a time, which seemed to leave no chance of continued existence to aught that was

not in its nature vigorous, might it not confidently have been said, This must be the crisis of Christianity? If it be not inwardly sound—if it have not a true hold of human nature—if it be a thing of feebleness and dotage, fit only for cells, and cowls, and the precincts of spiritual despotism—if it be not adapted to the world of action—if it have no sympathy with the feelings of men,—of freemen;—nothing can save it: no power of princes, no devices of priests, will avail to rear it anew, and to replace it in the veneration of the people; or at least in any country, where has been felt the freshening gale of intellectual life. The result of this crisis need not be narrated.

Another species of trial was in store to give proof of the indestructibility and victorious power of Christianity. It remained to be seen whether, when the agitations, political and moral, consequent upon the great schisms which had taken place in Europe had subsided, and when the season of slumber and exhaustion came on, and when human reason, polished and tempered by physical science and elegant literature, should awake fully to the consciousness of its powers; whether then the religion of the Bible could retain its hold of the nations;—or at least of those of them that enjoyed without limit the happy influences of political liberality and intellectual light. This was a sort of crisis which Christianity had not before passed through.

And what were the omens under which it entered upon the new trial of its strength? Were the friends of Christianity at that moment of portentous conflict awake, and vigilant, and stout-hearted, and thoroughly armed to repel assaults? The very reverse was the fact. For at the instant when the atheistical conspiracy made its long-concerted, and well-advised, and consentaneous, and furious attack, there was scarcely a pulse of life left in the Christian body, in any one of the Protestant States. The old superstitions had crawled back into many of their ancient corners. The spirit of protestation against the superstitions had breathed itself away in trivial wranglings, or had given place to infidelity—infidelity aggravated by stalled hypocrisy. The Church of England—the chief prop of modern Christianity, was torpid, and fainting under the incubus of false doctrine and a secular spirit, and seemed incapable of the effort which the peril of the time demanded: none of her sons were panoplied, and sound-hearted, as champions in such a cause should be. Within a part only of a small body of Dissenters (for a part was smitten with the plague of heresy) and that part in great measure disqualified from free and energetic action by rigidities, and scruples, and divisions—was contained almost all the religious life and fervor anywhere to be found in Christendom.

Meanwhile the infidel machinators had chosen their ground at leisure, and were wrought to the highest pitch of energy by a confident, and as it might seem, a well-founded hope of success. They were backed by the secret wishes, or the undissembled cheerings of almost the entire body of educated men throughout Europe. They used the only language then common to the civilized world, and a language which might be imagined to have been framed and finished designedly to accomplish the demolition of whatever was

grave and venerated ;—a language beyond any other of raillery, of insinuation, and of sophistry ; a language of polished missiles, whose temper could penetrate not only the cloak of imposture, but the shield of truth.

At the same portentous moment, the shocks and upheavings of political commotion opened a thousand fissures in the ancient structure of moral and religious sentiment, and the enemies of Christianity, surprised by unexpected success, rushed forward to achieve an easy triumph. The firmest and the wisest friends of old opinions desponded, and many probably believed that a few years would see Atheism the universal doctrine of the western nations, as well as military despotism the only form of government.

It is hard to imagine a single advantage that was lacking to the promoters of infidelity, or a single circumstance of peril and ill-omen that was not present to deepen the gloom of the friends of religion. The actual issue of that signal crisis is before our eyes in the freshness of a recent event. Christianity—we ask not whether for the benefit or the injury of the world—has triumphed ; the mere fact is all that concerns our argument.

The spread of the English stock, and language, and literature, over the North American continent, has afforded a distinct and very significant proof of the power of Christianity to retain its hold of the human mind, and of its aptness to run hand-in-hand with civilization, even when unaided by those secular succors to which its enemies in malice, and some of its friends in over-caution, are prone to attribute too much importance. The tendency of republicanism, which obviously has some strong affinity with infidelity—and the connection of the colonies, at the moment of their revolt, with France—and the prevalence of a peculiarly eager and uncorrected commercial temper, and the absence of every sort and semblance of restraint upon opinion—were concurrent circumstances, belonging to the infancy of the American Union, of a kind which put to the severest test the intrinsic power of Christianity, in retaining its hold of the human mind. Could infidel experimenters have wished for conditions more equitable under which to try the respective forces of the opposing systems ?

And what has been the issue ? It is true that infidelity holds still its ground in the United States, and there, as in Europe, keeps company with whatever is debauched, sordid, oppressive, reckless, ruffian-like. But at the same time Christianity has gained, rather than lost ground, and shows itself there in a style of as much fervor and zeal as in England ;—and perhaps, even, has the advantage in these respects. Wherever, on that continent, good order and intelligence are spreading, there also the religion of the Bible spreads. And if it be probable that the English race, and language, and institutions, will, in a century, pervade its deserts, all appearances favor the belief that the edifices of Christian worship will bless every landscape of the present wilderness that shall then “ blossom as the rose.”

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Memoir of Rev. Edward Payson, D. D. late Pastor of the Second Church in Portland.* Portland : Published by Ann L. Payson, 1830. pp. 444.

A Review of this interesting Memoir may be expected in a future number of the Spirit of the Pilgrims. Meanwhile, our readers, we hope, will anticipate us in reviewing the work, and forming a judgement for themselves.

2. *The Testimony of Scripture to the Obligations and Efficacy of Prayer, more especially of Prayer for the Gift of the Holy Spirit; in three Discourses.* By Gilbert Wardlaw, A. M. Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh. Boston : Peirce & Williams, 1830. pp. 142.

"This small volume is one of the number that almost simultaneously appeared among the Dissenters in Great Britain, during 1828 and 1829, pertaining to the subject of Revivals of Religion. Much interest has been excited there on this subject, and several of the most eminent clergymen, particularly among the Independents or Congregationalists, have earnestly examined, and written upon it. Among the sermons which have been published, those of Mr. Wardlaw are peculiarly valuable, for their admirable and perspicuous arrangement of the truth, on the subjects of which they treat. 'The remarks on the Prayer of Faith are lucid and satisfactory, without passing into extravagance on the one hand, or indifference on the other.'"

Appended to the work, is an 'Extract of a Letter from the Rev. D. Peter, Theological Tutor of the Academy at Carmarthen,' dated Feb. 7, 1829, giving an account of a general Revival of Religion in Wales, which had then been in progress more than a year. The writer is unable to state definitely how many have been added to the Baptist and Calvinistic Methodist Churches, but is confident that between three and four thousand have been added to the churches of the Independents!!

3. *Dyspepsy Forestalled and Resisted: or Lectures on Diet, Regimen, and Employment, delivered to the Students of Amherst College.* By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History. Amherst : J. S. & C. Adams. pp. 360.

We recommend this amusing publication to the consideration of all those, who are addicted to intemperate eating and drinking, to the use of tobacco and opium, to luxurious living, and a neglect of exercise;—to all, who are already suffering the deplorable consequence of these practices, or are in any danger of falling into them;—in short, to no inconsiderable portion of our entire population, and more especially to students, and persons engaged in sedentary pursuits. If duly studied and regarded, it may save them much expense, trouble, mortification, and suffering—from days of melancholy and nights of anguish—from premature infirmity, disease, and death.—The fourth lecture in the volume is the same as the Prize Essay by Professor Hitchcock, lately published under the direction of the American Temperance Society.

15. *The Infant School Manual, or Teacher's Assistant,* containing a View of the System of Infant Schools. Also a variety of Useful Lessons prepared for the use of Teachers. Worcester : Dorr & Howland, 1830. pp. 292.

4. *Daily Food for Christians*: being a Promise, and another Scriptural Portion, for every day in the year; together with a verse of a Hymn. First American from the eighth London Edition. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830.

The object of this little manual is sufficiently indicated by its title. It will be found a very suitable companion for the pocket or the parlor—suggesting, with each recurring day, a profitable topic of reflection, and thus administering to all who use it a portion of meat in due season.

5. *Letters on Female Character*, addressed to a young lady on the death of her mother. By MRS. VIRGINIA CARY. Second Edition, enlarged. Richmond: Ariel Works, 1830. pp. 220.

6. *Advice to a young Christian*, on the Importance of aiming at an elevated Standard of Piety. By a Village Pastor. With an Introductory Essay, by the Rev. Dr. ALEXANDER of Princeton, N. J. Second Edition, revised and corrected. New York: G. & C. & H. Carvill, 1830. pp. 196.

7. *The Brighter Age*: A Poem. By J. B. WATERBURY. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1830. pp. 94.

8. *Regeneration, and the Manner of its Occurrence*. A Sermon from John v. 24, preached at the opening of the Synod of New York, Oct. 20, 1829. By SAMUEL H. COX, D. D. Pastor of Leight Street Presbyterian Church. New York: Jonathan Leavitt. pp. 42.

9. *Influence of Religion on National Prosperity*: a Sermon delivered in Portsmouth, N. H., April 1, 1830, being the day of the Annual Fast. By JARED B. WATERBURY, Pastor of the Pleasant Street Church. Portsmouth: John W. Shepard. pp. 28.

10. *An Evangelical View of the Nature and Means of Regeneration*; comprising a Review of 'Dr. Tyler's Strictures.' By Evangelus Pacificus. Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1830. pp. 40.

11. *Vindication of the Strictures on the Review of Dr. Spring's Dissertation on the Means of Regeneration in the Christian Spectator for 1829, in reply to the Reviewer and Evangelus Pacificus*. By BENNET TYLER, D. D. Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Portland, Me. Portland: Shirley & Hyde, 1830. pp. 63.

12. *The Freedom of the Mind, demanded of American Freemen*; being Lectures to the Lyceum, on the Improvement of the People. By SAMUEL NOTT, JR. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1830. pp. 131.

This volume contains seven Lectures, on the following subjects: I. American Opportunity. II. Leisure in the Midst of Business. III. Self-Improvement. IV. Mental Pleasures open to the Public. V. The Claims of the Rising Generation. VI. The Demands of Business. VII. The Freedom of the Mind made Perfect.

13. *The Parable of the Ten Virgins*, illustrated in six Sermons. By JAMES WOOD, London, 1822. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams, 1830. pp. 132.

14. *Memoir of Mrs. Eleanor Emerson*; accompanied with Dr. Worcester's Sermon occasioned by her Death. With an Appendix. Third Edition. Boston: L. W. Kimball, 1830. pp. 154.

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

JULY, 1830.

NO. 7.

COMMUNICATIONS.

DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE LAST DAY.

It appears from the representations of our Lord that many, in the last great day, will experience unutterable disappointment. They expected admittance into heaven, but find it shut against them, and themselves excluded. Of the ten virgins, who went forth with their lamps to meet the bridegroom, only five were received to the marriage feast. The others came and cried for admittance, 'Lord, Lord, open unto us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.' 'Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity.' 'When once the master of the house has risen up, and shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us, and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are; then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets; but he shall say, I tell you I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.'

May it be deeply impressed, upon both writer and reader, that we are hasting together to the judgement; that to these eyes and ears its amazing realities will soon be revealed; and if so many, who indulged hopes of heaven, will be disappointed in that day, and find themselves forever excluded, are we sure that *we* shall not be of the number? The bare possibility of such an event

should excite the most wakeful apprehensions, and lead to the most diligent searchings of heart.—My object in this paper—an object of sufficient importance, surely, to command attention—will be to expose some of the grounds or reasons of those disappointments with which so many at the last will be overwhelmed.

1. Some will be disappointed, because they did not suppose any *particular traits of character were requisite*, in order to entitle them to the heavenly kingdom. They supposed that Christ died for all, in such a sense, that all of every character were authorized to expect salvation in his name. Or they believed that some means were provided, they hardly knew what, by which the whole race of men, without distinction, would eventually be received to heaven. Consequently they lived thoughtless and careless, engrossed with the trifles and the pleasures of the world, and neglected to form those holy, religious characters which many around them believed to be necessary. But—as there is any truth in the Bible—when persons of this description appear in the other world, they will find themselves most grievously disappointed. When they appear at heaven's gate, it will be shut against them; and shut, not only by the decree of the Saviour, but by the necessity of the case. They will be entirely unmeet for heaven. They will have an utter disrelish for divine employments and heavenly joys. They will see, that they could not be happy in heaven, if admitted, and, to their endless confusion, they will find, too late, that the blissful regions have no place for them. They must be excluded in outer darkness, and take their portion among the despairing and the miserable forever.

2. Not a few will be disappointed, when they appear before God in the other world, because they expected to have *there* a space for repentance. Unlike the class of whom I have spoken, these believed in the necessity of repentance; but they did not believe that the space for repentance was limited to the present world. They hoped it would be extended to the other world; and consequently, if they neglected religion here, that they should have an opportunity of embracing it hereafter. On this ground, they ventured to waste their time on earth, and to abuse the many opportunities with which they were favored. They loved the ways of sin, and presumed to persist in them, expecting there would be time enough for repentance, and a more convenient season for securing salvation, beyond the grave. But alas! when the thread of life is severed, and their immortal spirits appear in eternity, they find that they have been mistaken. They find, that as the tree has fallen, so it must lie; and that in the miserable state on which they have entered, no change for the better is to be expected. They must now reap according to that they have sown, and must be regarded and treated forever according to the deeds done in the body. Contrary to all previous expectation, they find that their

probation is ended, their space for repentance closed, and their souls irrecoverably lost. Thus their once cherished hopes have vanished like a dream, and they are destroyed, and that without remedy.

2. Many will be disappointed, when summoned into the other world, because they *did not live so long as they expected*. They believed that a return to God was necessary to prepare them to enjoy his presence and favor, and that this return must be accomplished on earth, or never; but still they did not think there was any need of haste. They were in the vigor of their days, in the full enjoyment of health; and if they thought of death at all, they thought of it only as a distant event. They were often warned that life was short and uncertain, and that their eternal well-being was at hazard; and they not unfrequently made resolutions that when they had arrived at a certain period, they would repent. But when the promised period came, they were not ready. They found the same hindrances and objections as before, and that these were rather increased than diminished by delay. Of course, they could not attend to the subject then, but still did not cease to hope that some more convenient season would arrive. In this way, life ran to waste, death was comparatively excluded from their thoughts, and the concerns of the immortal soul were neglected and forgotten. But in an unexpected manner and moment, disease invaded, and the dread messenger approached. They had scarcely time to look about them, and realize their situation, before all hope of life was extinguished, and the arm of the king of terrors was lifted for their destruction. At this dreadful hour their distress and horror were unspeakable. They shuddered—they resolved—they entreated for mercy: but nothing could stay or avert the lifted hand of death. It fell—it despatched them—it sent them into the eternal world—it disclosed to them in a moment that all was lost. It showed them that the half of their doom had not been told them, and left them to wail on forever, ‘The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.’

4. Numbers will be disappointed hereafter, because they have mistaken the *true character of God*. They believed that persons must love God in order to enjoy him, and they flattered themselves that they did love him. They supposed, indeed, that they had always loved him, and that the love of God was one of the most natural affections of the human heart. They could not doubt that they were the friends of God, and that the judgement scene would test the sincerity of their friendship. But when they appear in the eternal world, to their unutterable confusion, they find, that the God they loved so well is not there. They discover that their God was a mere fiction, and had no existence save in their own imaginings: for instead of taking the character of God as he had himself revealed it, they fashioned it after their own fancies, and

no wonder they loved it. No wonder they pleased themselves with the airy delusion. But though the phantom has fled, they find that the God of the Bible, the God of heaven remains. He remains, just as he revealed himself, glorious in holiness, angry with the wicked, delighting to show mercy to the penitent ; but he will by no means tarnish the honor of his law, or clear the guilty. How shall they meet this holy and just God? How shall they stand before him, and answer for denying him? They feel that they cannot do it; and in consternation and confusion they cry to the rocks and mountains to fall upon them, and hide them from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne.

5. Another class will be disappointed in the judgement, because they have *mistaken the nature of true religion*. They believed religion necessary, as a preparation for death, and they clung to something which they thought was religion. They continued to cling to it to the last. But the moment they step into eternity, they find that they have been deceived. They have mistaken the shadow for the substance, and have clung to that which cannot support them.

Some mistake their *orthodoxy* for religion, and because they are speculatively correct in their religious opinions, flatter themselves that they shall be accepted. But let such persons remember, that self-flattery like this is no part of orthodoxy—that there is such a thing as ‘holding the *truth* in unrighteousness’—that an enlightened head renders an unsanctified heart the more inexcusable—and that mere speculation, however correct and extended, cannot save them. ‘Thou believest there is one God,’ and believest many things which he has revealed ; ‘thou doest well : the devils also believe and tremble.’

Some mistake *external morality* for religion, and because they treat their fellow men with justice and kindness, and perform the relative and social duties, fancy that that they have all the religion which they shall ever need. They feel no deep sense of sin, and no need of a Saviour’s cleansing blood ; and though they live in a neglect of prayer and all the duties which they owe to God, they are content to rest on their own supposed righteousness, as the foundation of their hopes, and their preparation for heaven.—Notwithstanding the absurdity of views such as these, there are multitudes, it may be feared, who entertain them. Thousands under the gospel are living, dying, and going into eternity, with no better religion than this. How great must be their disappointment, when summoned into the presence of God in all the confidence of self-righteous expectation, to find that heaven has no place for them : to find that a preparation for heaven is a very different thing from what they had supposed : to find that all who rise to that world, go there, not on the ground of their own righteousness, but as those who have been pardoned for the sake of Christ : to find that the feeling which

pervades all heaven is, 'Not unto us, not unto us, but to Him who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, be all the glory of our salvation.'

Others mistake the nature of religion in a different way. They think it enough that they have had convictions of sin; that they have passed through something which they call conversion; that they have made a public profession of their faith; and are commonly regarded and spoken of as Christians. They do not love the duties of religion, and they neglect these duties as often as decency will allow. Their hearts are set upon the world, and they pursue it with unremitting ardor. Still, strange as it may seem, they do not doubt that their hearts have been renewed, that they have the essentials of religion, and that they are prepared to die in peace. Such persons seem to suppose that, in order to be religious, it is only necessary to pass through a certain process usually denominated conviction and conversion; and that prayer, and watchfulness, communion with God, and a strict religious life (though well enough for those who like them) are wholly unnecessary. Consequently, though they live after the manner of the world, and perhaps more loosely than many who make no pretensions to piety, they never doubt the reality of their religion or the goodness of their hope. But, if the representations of the Saviour are at all to be credited, such persons are preparing for an overwhelming disappointment. A shoreless eternity is before them; time, with resistless current, is bearing them on towards it, and the moment they enter there, they will find that they have no support. They will discover, at a glance, that they have been deceived, that they have mistaken the nature of true religion, that the gate of heaven is shut against them, and their souls are lost. And though they may stand without, and cry, 'Lord, Lord, open unto us; we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets;' a voice of thunder will reply, 'I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity.'

6. Many will be disappointed at the last, because they have mistaken the character of their *own exercises and feelings*. They believed that religion was necessary as a preparation for heaven, and that true religion is in its nature spiritual, having its seat in the affections of the soul. They trusted, also, that their own affections were of the right kind, and consequently that their title to heaven was sure; but in this respect their hearts deceived them.

Some mistake the excitement of mere animal sensibilities for the glow and fervor of religious affection. We are so constituted as to be susceptible of a variety of feelings connected with our animal nature, such as fear, joy, grief, natural affection, &c. These animal feelings are not unfrequently excited by religious considerations. The sufferings of Christ, the worth of the soul, the joys of heaven, and the pains of hell, may be so presented to the mind, as to excite

hopes and fears, desires and sympathies which are entirely of an animal nature. Feelings of this kind are usually ardent, strong, palpable to the sense, and peculiarly calculated to deceive the unwary. In many instances, they have been mistaken for holy affections, and persons, on the ground of them, have made high professions and indulged confident hopes. A religion of this character is usually transient. The gust of passion quickly subsides, and the sleep of worldliness returns. Or, where this is not strictly the case, the character is unstable, fitful, subject to inconsistencies and extravagancies, and easily distinguishable from the course of the just, which shines brighter and brighter to the perfect day. Still, those who are deceived by feelings such as have been described are usually fond of the delusion, and refuse to renounce it. They think much of their high religious exercises, perhaps boast of them, and regard themselves as elevated almost above the region of doubt, or the ordinary necessity of self-scrutiny. O what must be the disappointment of such persons, their weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, when they shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, and all the ransomed of the Lord, in the kingdom of glory, and they themselves thrust out !

But there is another mistake in regard to the nature of religious exercises, by which many are preparing themselves for disappointment hereafter. They do not distinguish between holy and selfish affections, and because their selfishness assumes a religious aspect, they please themselves with the idea that it is religion itself. They have something which they call the love of God, but it is a mere selfish love : they love him because they think he loves them, and is determined to save them. Their repentance too is of the same character. If anything more than mere compunction of conscience, or animal grief—if it is a sorrow of the heart at all, it is selfish sorrow ;—a sorrow for sin, not because it is wrong in itself, and has been committed against God, but because it is likely to injure them. With the same kind of affection they embrace the Saviour. They believe he has died for them, and will certainly save them, and they love him for the favors which they expect to receive from him. Under a delusion such as this, persons may also experience a joy in religion, which they mistake for holy joy, but which is entirely selfish. They believe that God loves them, and has pardoned all their sins, and will certainly make them happy forever ; and with such impressions, who would not rejoice ? These selfish affections may at times be ardent, may rise very high, and may leave the possessor of them in no doubt as to the reality of his religion, while it is obvious to other eyes that they have nothing of the nature of true religion in them. They are spurious, counterfeit, terminating on self and not on God, and such as a holy God cannot approve.—Persons deceived in this way will be very likely to go on, trusting to their false hopes and selfish affections, till the

light of eternity undeceives them ; and then their disappointment will be extreme. Thinking nothing but that they have religion, and their foundation is strong, till their eyes are opened in the other world ; what fearfulness must surprise them, what untold horrors must come over them, to find that they have been deceived, that they have no religion, that their lamps when most needed are gone out, and they are left in eternal night !

It may be easily conceived, that the disappointments, with which so many will be overtaken at the last, must be unutterably dreadful. Disappointments are painful, often almost beyond endurance, in the comparatively trifling concerns of the present life. Who then shall describe the anguish of disappointed, despairing souls, when the curtain of sense is withdrawn, and the scenes of the invisible world appear ? Who can conceive the misery of those, whose unsuspected, long-cherished hopes suddenly vanish, in the blaze of eternity, and under the searching eye of Jehovah ? They see the celestial city afar off, but it is shut against them. They see the happy company of the redeemed, but they must never be of their number. Instead of the approbation of God, they meet his frown. Instead of his favor, they endure his wrath. In place of expected glory and peace, they feel the gnawings of the never-dying worm, and the burnings of unquenchable fire. And what puts the seal upon their destruction is, they know it is irreversible. They know their dreadful state is fixed. Could they look forward to any period, however distant, when they should enjoy again the offers of the gospel, it would be some relief ; but no such prospect is presented. All around them is the blackness of darkness. All is horror and despair. And to meet this, in place of an expected heaven of glory and bliss,—what a difference ! What a depth of disappointment and wo !

To conceive of the subject more fully, make it, reader, your own case. You now indulge a hope of heaven. You flatter yourself that you have reason to hope. Your hope is dear to you, and you are unwilling to relinquish it. But admit it as *possible*, at least for a moment, that you may be deceived, and that were you called away in your present state, you must be found among the miserable. Suppose also that your summons had arrived, that the scenes of eternity had opened, and your future miseries were now disclosed. O tell me, fellow traveller to the judgement, tell me if you can, what would be your feelings under such circumstances. What a fearfulness would surprise you ! What a shuddering horror would come over you ! What a disappointment would overwhelm you ! Such a destruction of your fondest hopes—such a dashing of your most cherished expectations—such a fall—such a ruin ;—how could you or I sustain it !

And yet, is it not possible, beloved reader, that we may be deceived ? Is it not possible that we are preparing all this disap-

pointment and ruin for ourselves? I put these questions, not to inflict needless pain, but to give seasonable warning. We *need not* be deceived. We are under no necessity of urging our way onward to the judgement with 'a lie in our right hand.' Some of the more common grounds of deception and disappointment have been pointed out. Are we resting on them? Let every reader search his deceitful heart to the bottom, and determine for himself. There is a hope which, in the hour of trial, will be as an anchor to the tossed soul; and there is a hope which is as the spider's web. There is a hope of more value than worlds; and there is a hope which is worse than nothing. Both, reader, are before you. Both are within your reach. Give all diligence, and you may secure the one; sleep on in false security, and you must hold to the other. Every thing invites to instant watchfulness, examination, and effort. The suggestions of reason, the whispers of conscience, the decisions of God's word, all unite in saying, 'Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' Heaven lifts its portals to allure you upward; hell warns you with terrific murmurs to turn away and come not thither; while a voice from the throne of judgement, loud as seven thunders, breaks upon the ear, '*Prepare to meet thy God.*'

OPINIONS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS RESPECTING THE
TRINITY.

No. 3.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

THIS celebrated father was born of heathen parents at Flavia Neapolis (the ancient Shechem) in Samaria, early in the second century of the Christian era. He had an ardent, inquisitive mind, an enthusiastic temperament, and a deep anxiety to ascertain religious truth; though naturally far enough from being of a philosophical turn. He felt his moral wants as a sinner, and was prepared to appreciate and love the gospel of Jesus Christ; but he had neither the native coolness nor the intellectual training necessary for accurate metaphysical speculations. His restless longings after some satisfactory religious hopes, led him to study the various systems of pagan philosophy; and, passing through the schools of the Stoics, the Peripatetics, and the Pythagoreans, he at last attached himself to the Platonists. The patience and

constancy of the Christians amid their sufferings and persecutions attracted his notice, and was at length the means of his conversion to Christianity. Here, as he himself informs us in his first Apology, his moral wants were satisfied, and he found that peace which he had sought for in vain in the Platonic philosophy.* He suffered martyrdom at Rome, A. D. 165.

The most important works of Justin, which have descended to us, are his two Apologies for the Christians, addressed to the Roman emperor, and his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. He is the first Christian writer who attempted to state the doctrine of the Deity of Christ in a scientific form, and to obviate the philosophical objections against it. It is important, therefore, to my present purpose, that copious extracts be made from his writings, and that his very style and forms of expression be preserved as nearly as possible, in order that his mode of thinking and reasoning may be distinctly understood. Before proceeding to an examination of these extracts, it will be necessary for the reader to have some knowledge of the theory which he adopted to reconcile the doctrine of the Deity of Christ with the unity of God.

The outlines of this theory, so far as I can understand it, are the following : The Logos in God is what reason is in man ; and so far, the Logos was in God from eternity, and one with God. This Logos is the source of all that is reasonable and true among men, so that not only the inspired writers enjoyed his influence, but also those heathen philosophers who communicated truth, such as Socrates, Plato, and others. Just before the creation of the world, God evolved the Logos, or a particle of the Logos, from himself : this is the generation of the Logos, and from this time he became the Son of God.† From the time when the Logos was evolved from the Father, he possessed his own peculiar substance or personality separate from the Father, and consequently was numerically distinct from him. By this Logos, the world was created and adorned. The Logos at length assumed a body for the good of men, in order to communicate to them a full view of the truth, which they had before received only in fragments.‡ Such is the theory ; I will now proceed to the extracts. I quote from the Benedictine edition, printed at Paris, A. D. 1740.

Dialogue with Trypho, cap. 61. “ In the beginning, before all creatures, God begat from himself a certain rational power, which is

* Compare Neander, Kirchengesch. B. I. S. 1110, and Lardner, Credibility, vol. ii. p. 258.

† This part of the theory evidently rests on the twofold meaning of the Greek word λογος, which signifies *reason*, and also a *word* spoken, as the developement of reason. The first meaning is applied to the Logos as it existed in God from eternity, and the second to the Logos after it was evolved from God : a distinction which was afterwards recognized in the phrases λογος ανδιαβητος and λογος περιφερεις or *Logos immanent* and *Logos emanant*.

‡ Compare Martini, Geschichte des Logos, S. 42.

sometimes called by the Holy Spirit the Glory of the Lord, sometimes Son, sometimes Wisdom, sometimes Angel, sometimes God, sometimes Lord and Logos; and he calls himself Leader (αρχιστρατηγον) appearing in the form of a man to Joshua the son of Nun. For he has all these appellations, because he ministers to the will of the Father, and was begotten of the Father by his will. Somewhat of the same kind we see happen to ourselves; for when we utter a [reasonable] word (ἵνα λόγον) we beget reason, not by cutting off, so that the reason (λογον) in us is diminished while we utter it. And the like in respect to fire; we see it produce another fire, and the fire is not diminished by which the kindling takes place, but remains the same." (pp. 157, 158.)

From the language of Justin in the above extract, it might be supposed that he uses the word Logos merely as a personification of the wisdom or creative power of God; but in another place, he strongly protests against such an opinion. As this is a point of considerable importance in the investigation of early opinions, and as the passage is very characteristic of the author, I will insert the whole paragraph.

Dialogue, cap. 128. "It has been shown by many things already said, that Christ, being Lord, and being God, the Son of God, and by power appearing first as man, and an angel, and in the glory of fire as he appeared in the bush, and in the judgement which came upon Sodom; I now again recur to all which I have written before from the Book of Exodus, respecting the appearance in the bush and the imposition of the name Jesus, and I add: Do not suppose, O friends, that I say these things often to no purpose. But since I know that some, wishing to forestall (προλεγων) these things, even say that the power of the Father of the universe appearing to Moses, or to Abraham, or to Jacob, is called angel in its approach to men, because by it the messages of the Father are communicated (αγγελωμαι); and glory, because it appears in a visible form (φανασια) before unapproachable; and is sometimes called a man and human, because it appears assuming such forms as the Father wills; and they call it Logos [word] because it bears the conversations from the Father to men; and also that this power cannot be cut off and separated from the Father. In like manner, they say, as the light of the sun upon the earth is not to be cut off and separated while the sun is in the heavens, and when the sun sets, the light is borne away with it; so also the Father, when he pleases, makes his power to go forth, and when he pleases, brings it back again to himself; and they teach that he acts in this manner also in regard to the angels. But it is demonstrated that the angels exist, and always remaining, are not revolved back into that from which they were made; and that this power, which the prophetic word calls God and angel, it has likewise been demonstrated at large, is not numbered by name only like the light of the sun, but is another one (εἰσεν τι) even in number. And in what was before written, I have discussed this matter briefly, saying, that this power was begotten from the Father, by his power

and will, but not by cutting off, as though the substance of the Father was divided, in like manner as all other things which are divided and cut off are not the same things as before they were cut off; and for the sake of example I took fire, which we see kindled by other fires, that not being diminished from which many can be kindled, but remaining the same." (pp. 221, 222.)

Dialogue, cap. 56. After quoting Psalm xlv. 6, 7, Justin says: "Answer me, whether you would say that any one is called God and Lord by the Holy Spirit, except the Father of the universe and his Christ; for I suppose that I have demonstrated to you from the Scriptures themselves, that not one of the two angels who descended to Sodom is he whom the Scriptures call Lord, but he who was with them, also called God when he appeared to Abraham." (p. 152.)

The principal text to which Justin appeals in proof of the generation of the Logos is Proverbs viii. 22; where the Seventy had erroneously translated the Hebrew word *נָפַח* by *ἐκτίσας* (created) instead of *ἐκτίσας* (possessed). He had access to the Old Testament only by the Septuagint translation, and he was regardless of the distinction between *κτίσας* and *γεννῶν* (create and beget), which the Arian controversy afterwards rendered so important. To prove the separate personality of the Logos, Justin quotes Gen. i. 26, 'Let US make,' &c. compared with iii. 23, 'Man has become as one of US:' also Gen. xix. 24, 'The Lord rained, &c. from the LORD;' expressions which he supposed to indicate a plurality of persons in the Godhead.* To the same purpose are the following quotations.

Dialogue with Trypho, cap. 59. "Bear with me while I demonstrate to you from the Book of Exodus, how the same one, both angel, and God, and Lord, and man, and human, appearing to Abraham and Isaac, appeared to and conversed with Moses in a flame of fire from the bush." (p. 156.)

Cap. 60. "As it has also been demonstrated to you by the words before written, he who said to Moses that he was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, is not the God, the Maker of the universe; but he who is shown to you, that he appeared to Abraham and to Jacob, ministering to the will of the Maker of all things, and likewise in the judgement of Sodom ministering to his will. So that even if it was as you say, that there were two, both angel and God, no one who has the least understanding will dare to say, that the Maker and Father of all things left his all above the heavens, and appeared on a little spot of earth."

This last quotation is in reply to an objection of Trypho, who, speaking of the vision of the burning bush, had said: "It was indeed an angel who was seen in a flame of fire, but it was God who talked with Moses; so that in this vision there were two together, both the angel and God."

* Compare Dialogue with Trypho, cap. lxi. p. 158, cap. lxii, cap. cxix. p. 222.

The quotations already made afford a fair specimen of the mode in which Justin reasoned, respecting the divine nature and distinct personality of the Logos. It is plain that there was not much of the philosophical precision of modern times in his thoughts on these subjects; and that his conceptions of spiritual objects were not very different from his conceptions of the objects of sense.

Speculative theology was then in its infancy. Justin knew full well what he ought to believe, and how he ought to feel and act; he could make the most touching appeals to the heart and conscience, and reason most powerfully on the adaptation of Christianity to the wants and woes of man; but in the business of metaphysical speculation; in the matter of philosophising on the doctrines of religion, for the purpose of pointing out their mutual relation, harmony, and consistency, and of obviating philosophical objections against them, he was not at home. Nature had never designed him for such an employment; while the remains of his heathen education, and the grossly *physical metaphysics* (if the expression be allowable) of the age, rendered his speculations still more crude and unsatisfactory than they would have been in a more philosophical age.

Of Justin's opinion respecting the general influence of the Logos on the virtuous heathen as well as Christians, a full developement may be found in Apol. ii. cap. 8, 10, and 13. pp. 94—97. One extract on this subject I will give, as a specimen of the rest.

Apol. i. cap. 46. "We have been taught, and have before declared, that Christ, the first-born of God, is that Logos of which all the race of men has partaken; wherefore, all that have lived according to reason (*μετὰ λόγον with the Logos,*) are Christians, although thought to be Atheists, such as Socrates and Heraclitus among the Greeks, and those like them; and among the barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misael, and Elias, and many others."—"In like manner, also, those who had lived without reason (*ἀνευ λόγου*) were wicked, and enemies to Christ, and murderers of those who have lived according to reason." (p. 71.)

There can be no doubt that Justin considered the Logos, in his external developement, as subordinate to the Father. The whole course of thought exhibited in the preceding extracts proves this; and a few passages will now be quoted in reference to the same point.

Apol. i. cap. 32. "But the first however, after God the Father and Lord of all, even the Son, is the Logos, who in a certain manner was incarnated and made man." (p. 50.)

Cap. 12. Speaking of the Logos, he says: "Than whom we know none a more noble and more just ruler, after God who begat him." (p. 50.)

Dialogue with Trypho, cap. 129. "When it is said *the Lord rained fire from the Lord out of heaven*, the prophetic word declares them to be two in number; the one indeed being upon earth, who says that he will descend to see the cry of Sodom, and the other being in the heavens, who is also the Lord of the Lord upon earth, as Father and God, and is to him the cause that he is also most powerful, and Lord and God." (p. 222.)

A few passages will now be adduced, showing that Justin considered the Son and the Spirit, as well as the Father, objects of religious worship.

Apol. ii. cap. 13. "After God, we worship and love the Logos from the unbegotten and unsearchable God; since for our sakes he became man, in order that he might become a participator even in our sufferings, and make a remedy for them." (p. 97.)

Dialogue with Trypho, cap. 93. "For he who loves God with all his heart and all his strength, being full of pious sentiments, will worship (*προσκύβω*) no other God; he will also worship that Angel, God willing it, who is beloved by the Lord, and is God himself."* (p. 190.)

Apol. i. cap. 13. "We will show that with reason we worship Jesus Christ, the teacher of these things to us, for this purpose born and crucified under Pontius Pilate, being the governor of Judea in the times of Tiberius Cæsar; we learning that he is the Son of the true God, and holding him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third rank." (p. 51.)

Thus far it is certain, that Justin regarded the Logos, as of the *same nature* with the Father, having been in him and a part of him from eternity; and he supposed that, after the Logos was begotten, he became subordinate or inferior to the Father, though still an object of divine worship. The question then occurs, how did Justin reconcile this notion with the doctrine of the divine unity? He shall answer for himself.

Dialogue with Trypho, cap. 56. "Returning to the Scriptures, I will endeavor to persuade you that the same one who appeared to Abraham, and to Jacob, and to Moses, being called and written God, is other than the God who made all things, in *number* I say, but not in *mind* (*νοῦς*). For I say that he never did anything but what he who made the world willed him both to do and say." (p. 152.)

It may now be asked, What is the difference between the opinion of Justin and that of Arius? Justin believed that the Logos from eternity was in the Father, a part of the Father; and consequently, when begotten, he proceeded immediately from the Father, was in all respects of the same nature with him, and subordinate only as *external*

* The Logos, and also the Spirit, is frequently called angel by the early Fathers.

Logos, after his developement from the mind of the Father. Justin would say that the Logos was either *begotten*, or *created*, or *made* ; and all these terms, in his use of them, stand for precisely the same idea, namely, the *external* developement of the Logos just before the creation of the world. This was the opinion of several of the Antenicene Fathers ; and in reference to this subject, they saw no difference between *begetting* and *creating*.

Arius could not rest satisfied with these general conceptions ; he must refine upon them, and push his theory to some more definite results. He accordingly rejected all idea of a generation immediately from God, as inconsistent with the divine unity ; and maintained that the Son was a mere creature, created in time, and having no existence coeternal with the Father in the divine mind. He believed, notwithstanding, that the Son is the most exalted of all the creatures of God, that he is in fact a sort of secondary God, and entitled to divine honors ; and one of his favorite texts was the famous passage in Acts xx. 28, because a God is there mentioned who has blood. This controversy first taught the Fathers to make a distinction between the verbs *γενέσθαι* and *γενναίω* a distinction which afterwards became the test of Orthodoxy. (Compare Martini, *Geschichte des Logos*, S. 100.)

From the writings of Justin Martyr it is evident, that he had been taught to regard Jesus Christ as God, as the proper object of religious worship, and of the same nature with the Father, though numerically distinct from him. This doctrine the Christians had been in the habit of believing, without making any attempt to explain it, or even to state it in a scientific form. But Justin was a philosopher by profession, and a companion of philosophers. He was therefore anxious to state and explain this doctrine, as well as others, in such a manner as to silence the objections of philosophers ; and the grossly corrupt philosophy of the age, his ardent feelings, his loose habits of thought, the remains of his heathen education, and his very imperfect knowledge of the true principles of interpreting Scripture, led to results such as have been exhibited. His mode of reasoning is conformed to the philosophy of that period, the particular discussion of which is reserved for a subsequent part of this investigation. On the principles of this philosophy, his explanations are neither so unsatisfactory nor inconsistent as they appear to be when estimated by the more refined metaphysics of the present day. It required a long course of training to bring the human mind to a distinct conception of the essential difference between matter and spirit ; and it is an attainment less common, even in our own enlightened age, than we are sometimes inclined to suppose.

TATIAN, an Assyrian by birth, was the disciple and warm admirer of Justin. He early became dissatisfied with the heathen religion and philosophy; and was at length brought to a knowledge of the true God, and prepared for the reception of Christianity, by reading the Old Testament. Of him we have only one short piece entitled, *An Address to the Greeks*, written about A. D. 170. His conceptions of spiritual objects are as little spiritualized as those of his master, Justin.

Cap. 5. "God was in the beginning; and the beginning (*αρχή*) we consider to be the power of the Logos. For the Lord of the universe, being himself the substance (*υποστάσις*) of all things, while yet the creation had not taken place, was alone. Inasmuch as he was all power, and was himself the substance of things visible and invisible, all things were with him by a rational power, and the Logos himself, which was in him, did subsist. By his will also the Logos leaped forth from his simple being (*ἵνα ἀπλῶς αὐτοῦ*); and the Logos, not going into emptiness (*κἀκεῖνον*), became the first-born work of the Father. This we know to be the beginning of the world. He was made by communication, not by cutting off; for that which is cut off, is separated from the first, but that which is communicated, (*οὐκ ἐκκεῖνον τὴν ἀρχὴν προσλαβόν**), makes no diminution in that whence it was taken. For as from one torch many torches are lighted, and the light of the first torch is not diminished by the kindling of the many torches; so also the Logos, going forth from the power of the Father, did not make him who begat him destitute of reason (*λογος*). For indeed I speak, and you hear; and yet I who speak do by no means become destitute of reason by the passing over of the word to you." (pp. 247, 248.)

ATHENAGORAS lived at the same period. He was originally an Athenian philosopher; and he evidently possessed a more philosophical mind, and had been habituated to a more correct style of thinking, than Justin. The only work of his which we have, is a short *Apology for Christianity*, addressed to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 175. The first extract from this work I will give in the translation of Professor Stuart. (See *Letters to Dr. Miller*, p. 31.)

Legat. Cap. 10. "I have sufficiently proved that we are not Atheists, who believe in one eternal God, unbegotten, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, known only by reason and understanding, surrounded by light, and beauty, and spirit, and indescribable power, who by his Word (*λογος*) created, adorned, and preserves all things. We acknowledge also a Son of God. Nor must any one think it ridiculous that God should have a Son. For not as the poets feign, who exhibit God nothing better than men, do we think, either concerning God the Father, or concerning the Son. But the Son of God is the Word of the Father in idea and in operation; for by him and through him were all things made, inasmuch as the Father

* These words I have not attempted to translate.

and Son are one. The Son moreover being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, by a oneness of energy and spirit, the Son of God in the understanding and reason (νοος καὶ λογος) of the Father.—What the Son is I will briefly declare. He is the first progeny (γεννημα) of the Father, not as made, (for God from the first being eternal understanding, had the Logos in himself, being eternally a reasonable intelligence,) but he came forth to be the idea and operation of all material things.—With this account agrees the spirit of prophecy. The Lord, saith he, created me in the beginning of his works." (pp. 286, 287.)

Legat. cap. 12. Athenagoras says, that Christians desire to preserve life only that they may know "God and his Logos, what is the unity of the Son with the Father, what is the connection of the Father with the Son, what the Spirit is, what is the oneness of these three (ενωσις τῶν τριῶν, or according to Gesner, τὸν τριῶν), and the distinction of these united, the Spirit, the Son, and the Father." (p. 289.)

Cap. 16. "God himself is all things in himself, Light unapproachable, the perfect Word, Spirit, Power, and Logos." (p. 291.)

THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, was cotemporary with Athenagoras. After his conversion to Christianity, which was occasioned by a study of the prophecies of the Old Testament, he became celebrated as a writer. He was the author of commentaries on the Scriptures, and of treatises against the heresies of Marcion and Hermogenes. Of his works, however, none remain but his three books to the heathen Autolykas, in which he refutes his objections to Christianity. (Neander, Kirchengesch, B. I. S. 1136.) In the extracts from Theophilus, compared with those from Athenagoras, we may see the difference between the grossness of the Asiatic, and the refinement of the Athenian philosophy.

Ad Autol. Lib. ii. cap. 10. "And in the first place, indeed, they [the prophets] have harmoniously taught us, that God made all things from those which did not exist; for nothing is coeval with God, but he himself being his own place, and needing nothing, and existing before the worlds, desired to make man; wherefore for him he prepared the world. For he who is created, is also needy; but he who is uncreated, is in need of nothing. Wherefore God, having his Logos dwelling within his own bowels, begat him with his wisdom, casting him forth before all things. This Logos he had for his assistant in the things created by him, and by him he made all things. He is called the beginning (αρχη) because he rules (αρχει) and governs all things which were created by him. He, therefore, being the Spirit of God, and the beginning, and wisdom, and power of the Most High, descended upon the prophets, and by them told the things respecting the creation of the world, and all other things. For the prophets were not when the world was created; but the wisdom of God, which is in him, and his holy Logos, which is always present with him." (p. 355.)

The next extract I will give in the translation of Professor Stuart, Letters to Dr. Miller, (pp. 37, 38.)

Cap. 22. "God, the Father of the Universe, is incomprehensible, and cannot be contained in any place. But his Logos, by whom he made all things, assuming the person of the Father, came into paradise in his person, and conversed with Adam. For the Holy Scripture teaches us that Adam said he heard a voice. Now what else is a voice, but the Word of God, who is his Son? not as the poets and mythologers speak of the sons of God, born of carnal intercourse, but, as truth declares, the Logos who was always immanent in the heart of God. Before anything was made, he had him for a counsellor, who was his understanding and his reason. But when God desired to make what he had purposed to make, he begat the Logos, produced the first-born of all creatures. Not that the Father deprived himself of reason; but having begotten the Logos, he converses always with his Logos (or reason). This the Holy Scriptures and all inspired men teach; of whom John says, In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God,—showing that, at first, God was alone and his Logos in him. Afterwards he says, And the Logos was God. All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. The Logos, therefore, being God and produced from God, when it seemed good to the Father of the universe, he sends him to any particular place," &c. (p. 365.)

IRENÆUS, bishop of Lyons, was contemporary with the writers already quoted. Tertullian and Origen were born at this period, but most of their works belong to the early part of the third century. These writers are the most celebrated of the Antenicene Fathers, whose works yet remain to be examined. Their writings are more copious, and there is more of philosophical precision in their thoughts and language, than we have found in the works which we have just been inspecting.

The early Fathers had not the aid of inspiration; their intellectual culture was exceedingly imperfect; they had hardly learned to distinguish between the qualities of matter and those of mind; and consequently, in all their speculations concerning the Divine Being, their conceptions appear to be grossly material. The opinion of Theophilus relating to the pre-existence and generation of the Logos is a striking illustration of this remark. If, therefore, we interpret the language of the Fathers by the principles of mental philosophy which prevail at the present day, we may make them avow sentiments which they never designed to inculcate. But if we honestly seek after the leading idea which guides all their speculation, and interpret their language with due regard to the modes of philosophising prevalent at that period, we need be at no loss in regard to what they really believed and taught. One thing will be observed in all their speculations which have been exhibited thus far, namely, that they uniformly take it for granted that *Christ is of the same nature*

with God, in his essence coeternal and identical with the Father, subordinate only in external developement as generated Logos. There can be but one divine nature. Whoever, therefore, acknowledges that Christ is of the same nature with God, is essentially a believer in the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. That the early Fathers acknowledged this there can be no doubt. They use expressions in regard to the Son which we should not adopt, and they do the same in regard to the Father; for their notions of spiritual existence and of the attributes essential to the Divine Being were altogether different from ours. It has cost many ages of severe study to bring the human mind to that definiteness and refinement of philosophical views respecting spiritual beings, to which it has now attained.

The doctrines of the Bible are always the same; but the theory, by which these doctrines are connected together and made to harmonize in a theological system, changes its form with the ever-varying philosophy of each successive age. The Bible, which is given by inspiration of God, is one thing; and the philosophy by which men attempt to systematize the doctrines of the Bible, is quite another thing.

ON HERESY.

THE word, heresy, is commonly understood to imply a departure from essential truth, and an adherence to fundamental error, in matters of religion. It is not a mistake merely, or a false judgment, which is renounced and discarded as soon as discovered. Were it nothing more than this, it would not be criminal; whereas, heresy, if persisted in, is fatal.

In opposition to this view of the subject, it has been contended, that, irrespective of opinion and sentiment, the word means *sect* only—that, as now used, it has no correspondent sense whatever in Scripture—that it designates an *effect*, not a *cause*—and that for the two first centuries, it never denoted an opinion, and never stood connected with any of the words usually signifying to teach or to preach.

The subject is important. Men are not rashly to condemn each other for heresy, in the common sense of the word; nor if it mean *sect*, and designate an effect rather than a cause, is it unimportant what sect is intended, and what relation we stand in towards it. In every view, the subject is worthy of attention.

Without asserting that the word is used in precisely the same sense in every place, my object in this paper will be to examine the

several passages in the New Testament where it is found, and thus to ascertain, as far as may be, the sense given to it by the inspired writers. Previous to this examination, it will be necessary to state, in brief, some of the principles of interpretation, and some of the facts concerned in the case.

In determining the use of words and phrases, and their meaning in different connexions, we are to consider the circumstances and apparent motives or designs of the writer or speaker ; the kind of composition in which they are found ; the circumstances of time and place ; the relation of the different persons concerned to one another ; the parties to which they belong, on supposition they are divided ; and, finally, the sentiments and views they reciprocally entertain of each other, and of things in general. These, and the like, are some of the first principles of interpretation. The facts important to be kept in mind, are, that in the time of Christ and his apostles, there were parties in religion, as there are now, some of which embraced more, and some less of revealed truth ; while one, though not perfect, was yet substantially approved ; that of the former, were the Sadducees and Pharisees and those generally whom Christ denominated "the world," and that of the latter, were those who "waited for consolation," and "looked for redemption in Jerusalem."

In passing to the examination of passages, suppose the result should favor, as to primary meaning, the idea of *sect*, as being that which, *αἵρεσις* the word translated heresy, more generally signifies ; and suppose it should designate an *effect*, not a *cause*, and so point out a division only, or the leaders of a party, and not the sentiments of the party ; yet, who does not know that cause and effect imply each other ? and that the idea of a sect or party necessarily implies some peculiarity of sentiment or practice, by which the sect or party is known ? And suppose the term be not, in every instance, accompanied with any express mark of reprobation ; are we of course to infer that no fatal error is involved in it ; while it is manifest that, in narration especially, or history, the sacred writers were wont generally to record facts, without formally expressing an opinion respecting them ?

But not to detain the reader ; the first passage to come under consideration is Acts v, 17, where *αἵρεσις* (heresy) is rendered *sect*, and is applied to the Sadducees. "Then the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, which is the *sect* of the Sadducees."

Suppose in this passage we render *αἵρεσις* doctrine, sentiment, or opinion ; what objection to such a translation ? 'Which is of the *doctrine, sentiment* or *opinion* of the Sadducees.' This certainly is not bad English ; nor do I perceive that it fails to express the fact which the writer wished to record. True, he neither approves, nor disapproves ; but shall we therefore infer the absence

of all hurtful error? Let us recur to our principles and facts. He had no occasion to commend or condemn the persons of whom he spake. His object was simply to record who they were. Had he been called to speak of their sentiments, and say whether he approved or disapproved them, we may reasonably suppose there would not have been wanting express marks of disapprobation.* Consider who the Sadducees were, what sentiments they held, and whether Christ and his apostles approved them. The Sadducees denied the resurrection, and believed neither angel nor spirit. And what is heresy, in the common acceptation of the word, if not involved in the denial of these great doctrines?

The next passage is Acts xv, 5, where *αἵρεσις* is again rendered *sect*. It is applied to the Pharisees, and used without commendation or censure. "But there rose up certain of the *sect* of the Pharisees." But with the same propriety as in the former case, the word here might be rendered doctrine, sentiment, or opinion; and we have only to call to mind what the doctrines of the Pharisees were, and how they were treated by Christ and his apostles, to see that they were a most fatal heresy, in the common acceptation of the word. That the Pharisees were the uniform opposers of Christ and the gospel is undeniable and notorious.

The next passage is Acts xxiv, 5, where the *sect* of the Nazarenes is spoken of. It is found in the speech of Tertullus, the orator, who informed against Paul before Felix. "We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the *sect* τῆς αἵρεσεως of the Nazarenes." Here, the word is applied to the gospel, and to those who embrace it. But we are to remember that this is not the language of the sacred historian, nor of his christian brethren, but of a bigotted Jew; and, in the estimation of the Jews, what could have been a greater heresy, as the word is commonly used, than Christianity? In the judgement of Tertullus and the Jews, the Nazarenes held to pernicious and destructive errors.

All this is confirmed by the next passage, which is the fourteenth verse of the same chapter. In this place, *αἵρεσις* is rendered *heresy*. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which *they* call *heresy*, so worship I the God of my fathers." These words contain, first, Paul's profession of his faith in the truth and importance of the gospel, and its consistency with the religion of his fathers; and, secondly, the estimation of this gospel by unbelievers, regarding it as a destructive error and fatal delusion. Here, certainly, the word is used in the common acceptation. How meagre and void would the whole passage be, were we to render it *sect*, irrespective of sentiment! "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call a *sect*, so worship I the God of

* See 2 Tim. ii, 17, 18. Titus iii, 10.

my fathers?" Beyond all question, Paul meant to admit, that, in the opinion of Tertullus and the Jews, the gospel *was* a ruinous error.

The next passage in order is Acts xxiv, 5, where Paul is speaking of his manner of life before conversion. "After the most straightest *sect αἵρεσις* of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." Here, says an eminent critic, 'It was manifestly Paul's intention to exalt the party to which he belonged, and to give their system the preference to every other system of Judaism, both in soundness of doctrine and purity of morals.' Be it so. I acknowledge that here, if anywhere, the word must be used in a good sense. But though, as he formerly regarded it, and as those whom he was addressing still regarded it, Pharisaism was the best of the Jewish systems; still, as the apostle now viewed it, might it not be called a heresy, in the common sense of the word? Why might not Paul as well "call" Pharisaism a heresy, as the Jews "call" christianity a heresy? Was not Pharisaism now as great a heresy to him, as christianity could be to them? Let not, then, a construction be put upon this passage, which will represent the apostle as passing a compliment upon those views, in the spirit of which he had once been a persecutor and injurious.

But I proceed to the next and last passage in the Acts (xxviii, 22,) where the word is rendered *sect*, and applied, as in xxvi, 5, to Christians: "For, as concerning this *sect*, we know that it is everywhere spoken against." This is the language of the unbelieving Jews to Paul; and here, evidently, the word must be understood of doctrine or sentiment. They say, "But we desire to hear of thee what thou *thinkest*;" which is an inquiry after belief. They had heard various accounts of the belief of the Christians; now they come to Paul to know the truth. No mention is made of persons any way, and no substantial reason can be given why doctrine, or sentiment, or christianity as a system, may not be the chief thing meant by the word *αἵρεσις*. Indeed, that such is the fact, this additional consideration proves, namely, that Christianity was considered, even by Pagans (and if by them, much more by the Jews) as "*a new and mischievous superstition*." At any rate, those who employed the term in this passage regarded christianity in this light. They considered Christ as an impostor, and his religion as subverting the religion of their fathers—a heresy certainly, in their judgment, surpassed by nothing that has since borne the name.

I pass now to the Epistles, in which the word in question is found but three times. It occurs first, in 1 Cor. xi, 19. "For there must be also heresies *αἵρεσις* among you." In this passage, says the critic before referred to, the term 'has no necessary reference to doctrine, true or false.' But why? it may be asked, why has it no reference to doctrine? How does it appear that heresies (*αἵρεσις*) in the nineteenth verse means the same thing as *σχίσματα* in the preceding; and that neither relates to doctrine?

Do not ecclesiastical divisions σχίσματα (except those that are friendly, and mutually consented to for the better promotion of the same cause,) commonly grow out of differences in doctrine? Did they not here in the Corinthian church? Instead of meaning the same thing, the terms hold to each other the relation of cause and effect, and heresies (false doctrines) are the cause.

The next passage is Gal. v. 20, where heresies are coupled with various sins; such as idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, &c.; a connexion, surely, in which it would be strange to find *sect*. Let us learn from this instance, to distrust a criticism, however fair in some respects, which teaches that ‘the word *heresy*, in the modern acceptation, never suits the import of the original word, as used in Scripture.’ The word may mean in this passage divisions, or the contentions out of which they grow, or (more radical still, and which is more probable,) the *errors* which so often cause both.

I pass to the only remaining passage in the New Testament, namely, 2 Peter ii, 1; “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who shall privily bring in damnable *heresies*, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bringing upon themselves swift destruction.”—In this passage, αἵρεσις is connected with another word, ἀπωλείας, which must be considered. This word is found in the New Testament twenty times; in one of which it is rendered damnation; in two waste; in four by a phrase, as in this passage; in five destruction; and in the remaining eight, perdition. In this passage, instead of “damnable heresies,” which is more conformable to our English idiom, the phrase might be rendered “heresies of damnation.” This would seem to suggest, what appears to be the fact as to the use of αἵρεσις, that while it may have originally meant a sect merely, or been used “in a general and indeterminate signification,” it soon came to mean something more, as has been shown in this discussion, and that before “the close of the two first centuries,” yea, before the writing of this Epistle, it came to mean destructive or damnable doctrine,—“denying the Lord that bought them.”

I might extend this investigation to one passage more, Titus iii, 10, where, though not the abstract αἵρεσις we have the concrete, αἱρετικὸς; “A man that is an *heretic*, after the first and second admonition reject.” But here I should come to the same conclusion as before, and therefore I pass it without further notice; while, with a single thought in relation to the application of the passage in Peter, my communication will be concluded.

And here I would say, that as Christ crucified, or the atonement of Christ, is the foundation of all hope for sinners, so those who deny this doctrine, differing or agreeing in whatever else they may, are the persons referred to by the apostle, when he speaks of

“damnable heresies.” It is not necessary to suppose that he referred to any particular sect or heretical doctrine, in distinction from all others. He may have referred to many, or to any which should arise, some denying in one form, and some another, the *Lord that bought them*.

Inasmuch as there are heresies in our own time, and heresies of destruction, let every one be on his guard, lest he be ensnared and destroyed. ‘Denying the Lord that bought us,’ what have we on which to rest? “There is no other name given among men whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus.” Let us all pray, “Lead us not into temptation.” May God save the writer and readers of this article from all those heresies, which, if imbibed and persisted in, must inevitably destroy the soul. VERAX.

REVIEWS.

ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF RHETORICAL DELIVERY, AS APPLIED IN READING AND SPEAKING. *By Ebenezer Porter, D. D., Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Third Edition. Andover: Flagg & Gould. 1830.

(Concluded from page 323.)

THE subject of *modulation* is “enviored with difficulty” truly embarrassing, especially as it has been presented by most rhetoricians. The variety of sentiment expressed in composition requires variety in managing the voice. This is what we understand by modulation. To communicate instruction on this subject by writing, has been the least successful attempt of the elocutionist. Here the aid of the living voice is needed. No rules or system of notation, however perfect, can be considered as an adequate substitute for the living teacher. But where no such teacher is at command, much assistance may be derived from a work like the one before us.

Among the faults of modulation two are noticed, namely, *monotony*, “that dull repetition of sounds, on the same pitch, and with the same quantity,” and *mechanical variety*, which consists in uttering a sentence with “the greatest possible number of notes”—or with “a frequent change of stress”—or, more frequently, “in the habit of striking a sentence at the beginning, with a high and full voice, which becomes gradually weaker and lower, as the sen-

tence proceeds." In treating of the *remedies*, Dr. P. suggests, that "the most indispensable attainment towards the cure of bad habits in managing the voice, is the *spirit of emphasis*." Another attainment necessary, is "some good degree of discrimination as to vocal tones and inflections." The remedies here suggested, and illustrated in the work, are not difficult in their application; and we know of no apology that the public speaker can offer, for neglecting the means placed at his command, to correct his defective habits of elocution, and learn to speak well.

"With discriminating ear," says our author, "and perfect command of his voice, why has he a bad modulation in delivery? His talent is hid in a napkin;—he is too *slothful* to use a gift of his Creator, which in possession of another man, might be an invaluable treasure. Paradox as it may seem, it is only the plain statement of a well known fact, to say, that many a man, while devoting ten years to studies preparatory to professional life, deliberately looks forward to his main business, as one in which his success and usefulness must depend on his talent in *speaking*,—yet takes no pains to *speak well*! Perhaps of these ten years, he does not employ one entire week in all, to acquire this talent, without which all other acquisitions are, to his purposes, comparatively useless"!

The just modulation of the voice requires judgement and discrimination in respect to several essential points. The *pitch*, recommended as the most suitable at the commencement of delivery, is the *middle key*. This is the key of animated conversation, and admits of that elevation and depression, variety and energy, which are absolutely indispensable to a good delivery. The rule of Dr. Blair, to commence speaking as if addressing the most distant persons in the audience, would require so high a pitch that, to rise from it, as emotion might prompt, would put in requisition Stentorian lungs, or carry up the voice to an "unmanageable elevation." The opposite extreme, to which Walker's rule would be likely to lead, should be avoided; for hearers are soon weary with the effort of listening.

The reason why some speakers are heard with difficulty is not, in general, that their key-note is too low, but that it is not swelled to a full sound. The defect is in *quantity*, a term used to designate both the fullness of tone, and the time of utterance. Power and compass of voice are indispensable to a commanding elocution. Where the organs of speech are perfect, the lungs sound, and the chest well constructed, all that is necessary to acquire a powerful voice, and skill to command its various keys, is *vocal exercise*. How was it that David Garrick could make himself distinctly heard by an audience of ten thousand, when he spoke on his under-key? He exercised his voice on that key. How did Bridaine and Whitefield acquire such energy of vocal power, that they could, in open air, make the thunder of their eloquence distinctly audible to an assembly of twenty thousand! They exercised their voice, till it was capable of trumpet-tones that would command and silence "the

tumult of the people." The directions which are given by Dr. P., as means of preserving the lungs and strengthening the voice, are well worthy of attention.

As to *time* or *rate* of utterance, he observes, that the habits of different men may differ considerably, without being chargeable with fault. "But," says he, "I refer rather to the difference which emotion will produce, in the rate of the same individual. Those passions which quicken or retard a man's step in walking, will produce a similar effect on his voice in speaking. Narration is equable and flowing; vehemence, firm and accelerated; anger and joy, rapid. Whereas dignity, authority, sublimity, awe,—assume deeper tones, and a slower movement."

The accomplished speaker, whose soul is warmed and moved with his subject, will so time his *pauses*, that by "expressive silence" he will produce a powerful effect. We recollect hearing a gentleman remark of Dr. Chalmers' manner in the pulpit, that "his pauses were tremendous." Garrick and Whitefield managed the "rhetorical pause" with prodigious effect. "It occurs," as Dr. P. remarks, "sometimes before, but commonly after a striking thought is uttered, which the speaker thus presents to the hearers, as worthy of special attention, and which he seems confidently to expect will command assent, and be fixed in the memory, by a moment of uninterrupted reflection."

The general subject of transition assumes, in the hands of our author, an original aspect, especially as it respects the system of *notation*, designed as a substitute for the assistance of a living teacher. As the standing law of delivery is, "that vocal tones should correspond in variety with sentiments, in contradistinction from monotony, and from that variety which is either accidental or mechanical," something like this system of notation will be found, we doubt not, of practical utility. We are not without apprehensions, that in some cases it may be liable to perversion;—in many, however, it will be resorted to with desirable effect. The author, with his characteristic caution, suggests it merely as an *experiment*. There may be diversity in the taste of good critics respecting the application of this notation in numerous passages; but this might be expected, even if the system were as perfect as the nature of the subject would admit. We would recommend to all, who wish to correct a bad manner of delivery, or to acquire a good one," critical and patient attention to this part of Dr. Porter's work, as illustrated and applied in the Exercises which are appended.

Another thing pertaining to modulation is *expression*. This quality is that "modification of the voice, which accompanies awakened sensibility of soul"—and which "constitutes the *unction* of delivery." Expression, in most cases, defies mechanical imitation, and the government of rules. Very few will succeed in imparting

to their elocution the thrilling influences of this inimitable quality, whose hearts are not moved.

Si vis me flere, dolendum est
Primum ipsi tibi.

An affected sensibility will generally be detected. It must be *real* pity, that would express "pathetic exhortation." On this point we subjoin what our author has expressed :—

"The indescribable power communicated to the voice by a delicate sensibility, especially a Christian sensibility, it is quite beyond the reach of art to imitate. It depends on the vivid excitement of real feeling; and, in Christian oratory, implies that expansion and elevation of the soul, which arise only from a just feeling of religious truth. The man whose temperament is so phlegmatic, that he cannot kindle with emotion, at least with such degree of emotion as will show itself in his countenance and voice, may be useful in some departments of learning, but the decision of his Creator is stamped upon him, that he was not made for a public speaker."

It was our intention to have gone into a more particular consideration of *Rhetorical Action*, than the limits of this article will admit, after what has been said on the management of the voice. It is a subject which claims, in our opinion, more attention than it has generally received. We admit that some powerful speakers are reckless of all rules or care, as it respects their action in delivery; it does not follow, however, that the power of their eloquence would not be augmented by a correct and dignified action. Gigantic genius, whose splendid creations are accompanied with fervid emotion, possesses a spirit-stirring energy, that always produces effect, in despite of awkwardness of manner. This does not prove that those who are not favored with an equal power of intellect may dispense with the advantages derived from just and graceful action. Rhetorical action, as treated in the work before us, includes *attitudes* and *expression of countenance*. It is what Cicero calls "*sermo corporis*," and what ancient orators studied with care, and practised with surprising effect. In the judgment of Demosthenes, it was the first point of excellence in the public speaker.*

Two extremes relating to this subject are noticed by Dr. Porter, viz—"that which encumbers a speaker with so much technical regulation of his movements as to make him an automaton;" and "that which condemns all precepts, and all preparatory practice too, as mischievous in their influence." The action which belongs to good delivery is such as corresponds with thought and emotion, and hence it arises from *nature*. The attitudes of men are significant, often indicating the personal qualities of individuals; as "the measured pace of the ploughman, the strut of the coxcomb, and the dignified gait of the military chief." That gesture may be significant is proved by the fact, that it furnishes a medium of rapid communication between deaf-mutes. The speaker who delivers himself with the grace and majesty of appropriate attitude and expression of countenance, will, other things being equal, possess

* Cicero de Oratore, Lib. iii.

a decided superiority over him, who stands like a wax figure, and speaks without moving a muscle or a limb. Such an inanimate manner ill becomes the faithful messenger of truth.

It has been said, "the tap of Cæsar's finger was enough to awe a Roman senate." Paul, by a significant gesture, quelled the uproar of a tumultuous assembly, which he addressed from the stairs of the temple. And could we see him in the attitude he assumed, when he preached at Athens, his spirit all the while stirring in him, we should have before us a figure, not less dignified and commanding than that, designed and executed by the genius of Raphael, which represents the apostle as lifting up his arms, and pouring out the thunder of his rhetoric, amidst an audience of pagan philosophers.

The fault of public speakers, however, is not so much a *want* of action, as it is unmeaning and unnatural action. Our author has therefore directed the main drift of his remarks to the common faults that prevail in this department of delivery. These he attributes chiefly to *personal defects*, *diffidence*, and *imitation*; principally to an "unmanly diffidence," by which the young speaker especially is, in many instances, fettered and embarrassed. Those noticed in the work under review, have respect to the *countenance*, *attitude* and *gesture*.

The principal source of the expression that beams from the countenance is the *eye*. "Inago animi vultus est, indices oculi."* There is in the human eye a varied power of expression capable of immense effect. "Indeed (says Beattie) this little organ, whether sparkling with joy, or melting in sorrow; whether gleaming with indignation, or languishing in tenderness; whether glowing with the steady light of deliberate valor, or sending forth emanations of good will and gratitude, is one of the most interesting objects in the whole universe. There is more in it than shape, motion, and color; there is thought and passion; there is life and soul; there is reason and speech." The most common fault noticed by Dr. Porter is the eye "bent on vacuity," by which its significance is sunk, its expression lost. There is the "indefinite sweep of the eye, resting steadily nowhere," and also a "tremulous, waving cast of the eye, and winking of the eyelid," all which arise generally from a fear of looking an audience directly in the face, and always prevent the effect produced by a collected and manly expression of the countenance. Servile confinement to notes, in many instances, destroys the expression of which the countenance is capable. The hearer, anxious to catch an enlivening gleam from the kindling features, must watch attentively for those brief intervals, when the speaker ventures to lift up his head, while uttering part of a line, or reciting a familiar passage of scripture. These defects we have often noticed, and sometimes with a feeling bordering on impatience, that the expression of an eye,

* Cicero.

capable of sending a look to the very heart, should be utterly lost, in the effort of picking up the lines of a manuscript, or by an unmanly gaze at nothing.

In the attitude of a speaker improprieties are not unfrequent. Sometimes there is an appearance of haughtiness, and at other times of indolence. Sometimes an awkward stiffness of posture is exhibited ; in other cases, too much motion. We have noticed a "violent tossing of the body from side to side, rising on the toes, or writhing of the shoulders and limbs." We have seen the speaker, in the earnestness of his eloquence, stand with his hands locked behind him, like a pinioned culprit. In the attitude of man there is something noble, dignified, and commanding, which is worse than lost to the speaker, who has contracted careless and awkward habits in delivery.

The most numerous class of faults noticed by Dr. Porter, pertain to *gesture*. Among these he mentions want of *appropriateness*. Rhetorical action, in order to be appropriate, must be suited to the various circumstances, under which one is called to speak. In speaking to a common audience, more boldness of action would be admissible, than in addressing a prince on his throne, or a bench of judges in the supreme court of the nation. Addresses to Jehovah, and the utterance of language in which he is personified, do not, as our author has noticed, admit of gesture.

There are faults arising from a want of *discrimination*, "which consist in acting *words* instead of *thoughts*. On this point, Dr. Porter has remarked ;—

If there is language in action, it requires propriety and precision. The indiscriminate movement of the hands signifies nothing. Want of *emphasis* in this language is a great, but common fault. When the speaker, however, has an emphatic stroke of the hand, its effect is lost if that stroke does not accompany the emphasis of the voice ; that is, if it falls one syllable after the stress of voice, or if it is disproportionate in force to that stress, in the same degree its meaning is impaired. The direction of the hand, too, in which the emphatic stroke terminates, is significant. The elevated termination suits high passions ; the horizontal, decision ; the downward, disapprobation. And any of these may denote definitive designation of particular objects."

An *excess* of action is a frequent fault. It has been said of Garrick, who was pre-eminent for the power of his action, that his gestures were few, but full of meaning ;—they always spoke. Action may be too *violent* as well as too frequent.

"Such are the habits of some men, that they can never raise the hand, without stretching the arm at full length above the head, or in a horizontal sweep ; or drawing it back, as if in the attitude of prostrating some giant at a stroke. But such a man seems to forget that gentleness, and tranquillity, and dignity, are attributes that prevail more than violence, in real oratory. The full stroke of the hand, with extended arm, should be reserved for its own appropriate occasions. For common purposes, a smaller movement is sufficient, and even more expressive."

Good taste is offended at a violent beating of the air, and especially when the force of the stroke falls with clenched fist upon the

cushion or the desk. The speaker has the appearance of one in anger, and by the vehemence of seeming indignation he creates in many of his hearers a feeling of repugnance, which prevents persuasion and conviction.

Action may be too complex. "When there is a want of precision in the intellectual habits of the speaker, he adopts, perhaps, two or three gestures for one thought. In this way, all simplicity is sacrificed; for though the idea is complex, an attempt to exhibit each shade of meaning by the hand is ridiculous." p. 160.

Another common defect is too great *uniformity* of action. The effect is analogous to that produced by monotony in utterance. "This barren sameness in a man's manner usually prevails, just in proportion as it is ungraceful." Where there is but *one* gesture, whether graceful or awkward, it soon loses its significance, and becomes tame. If we do not misjudge, a dull uniformity is the besetting and prevailing fault in public speakers.

To the class of defects which Dr. Porter has noticed, others doubtless might be added. He has specified those which are the more prominent and frequent. Wherever they exist, determined effort should be made to correct them, especially if age has not given them a stubbornness that defies discipline. The rules of rhetorical action are by no means complicated; nor are they so difficult, that any need shrink from the task of making them familiar,—which must be done, before they can be reduced to practice without affectation or stiffness. We fully concur in the opinion expressed by our author, that "any man who has good sense, and a warm heart, if his faculties for elocution are not essentially defective, and if he is patient and faithful in the discipline of these faculties, may render himself an agreeable and impressive speaker." Though we avow ourselves the advocates of a thorough and systematic attention to the whole manner of delivery, and would commend the speaking art to those especially who preside over our literary institutions, we protest vehemently against that cold, studied precision of movement—that affectation of correctness, which those may exhibit, who have the form, without the soul and spirit of delivery. Let correct habits be acquired, and emotion, such as every commanding speaker must have, will prevent affectation.

The principles stated, and illustrated with so many apposite remarks and examples in the work before us, are founded in emotion. If this vital energy be wanting, no rules, no instruction, will supply the means of a just and powerful delivery. We mean by emotion that sensibility of soul, excited by the spirit-stirring influence of some affecting or important subject, which it is the speaker's business to exhibit, and impress on his hearers. "Be it remembered," says Dr. P. "that all directions as to management of voice, must be regarded as subsidiary to the expression of *feeling*, or they are worse than useless." The chisel of a Phideas or Cornova may

from a shapeless block of marble bring up the figure of a man, and give him the exquisite finish and symmetry of a Theseus or Apollo Belvidere ; but it cannot light up the eye with the beamings of a living expression. So may art smooth from the awkward speaker the ruggedness of his perverted habits, give him gracefulness of attitude, command of tones, power of voice, and discrimination of taste ; and yet it cannot produce "one flash of passion on the cheek, one beam of feeling from the eye, one thrilling note of sensibility from the tongue." The soul must be kindled within him, his heart must grow warm with the subject, or he will not pour forth the breathings of true eloquence.

Isocrates was accomplished with all the rhetorical graces which ancient art could furnish. He could amuse with his vainly gay and florid eloquence ; but he was destitute of emotion, and he produced but little effect. Demosthenes, says Fenélon, "moves, warms, and captivates the heart. He was sensibly touched with the interests of his country. His discourses gradually increase in force, by greater light and new reasons, which are always illustrated by bold figures and lively images. One cannot but see that he has the good of the republic entirely at heart, and that nature itself speaks in all his transports." "Shall we imagine" the same writer observes in another place, "that the ministers of the gospel have less concern for the eternal salvation of souls, than Demosthenes for the liberty of his country ?" The connection between pulpit eloquence and the success of the ministry has, we are compelled to believe, been too generally overlooked. To this perhaps the fact may be attributed, that so few, comparatively, who minister at the altar, have a just and commanding elocution. It cannot be objected, that the subjects of the preacher's discourses are deficient in that pathos, interest, and importance, necessary to stir up the soul, and awaken emotion.

"He that negotiates between God and man,
As God's ambassador, the great concerns
Of judgement and of mercy,"

should be the last man to exhibit dulness, or carelessness, when officiating in the solemn assembly—

"When sent with God's commission to the heart !"

"If Pericles could shake the firmest resolutions of his hearers, and set the passions of all Greece in a ferment, when the public welfare of his country, or the fear of hostile invasions was the subject ; what may we not expect from him, who, with a becoming energy, warns his audience against those evils which have no remedy, when once undergone ?"*

It was the command of pulpit eloquence, which, with the blessing of God, made Luther the successful champion of the reformation. Destitute of advantages from this source, he would not have

lifted his voice above the thunders of the Vatican, or burst the chains of an enslaved world. It was this that enabled Knox to rise amidst the tempestuous elements of a feudal age, and plead the cause of truth, and break from the Scottish church the bonds of Rome. Whenever he addressed an audience, "his spirit was stirred in him." Said he, "I never entered the pulpit without trembling." Bossuet was the "bright and shining light" of the French pulpit, in the age of Louis XIV. When he rose to speak of life, and death, judgement, and eternity, nobility quailed, and the king trembled. He moved on a tide of eloquence with irresistible majesty. "What distinguishes him most," says a French critic, "is the ardor of his feelings; the girding up of his whole soul to the object before him." President Davies has been pronounced one of the most accomplished pulpit orators, that our country has produced. Though he died at the age of thirty-six, he reared a monument of sacred eloquence, that will outlive the stupendous architecture that gives renown to the Dynasty of the Pharaohs. We could mention other names, alike preeminent both for the success of their ministrations, and a commanding elocution—names, the precious memory of which will for a long time linger in our churches.

"These stars have set;—O rise some other such."

If we mistake not "the signs of the times," a crisis is pending, which will require a great increase of the "legitimate, peculiar powers" of the pulpit, if it is to stand acknowledged, as it has been,

"The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of Virtue's cause."

It is a day of blasphemy, rebuke, and opposition in regard to pure religion. The warring, restless elements of human wickedness portend a conflict, to sustain which, all the energies of the church of God will have to be put in requisition. There is a tide rising in the moral affairs of this country, whose violent waves will not be stayed by such means as have been found competent during times of less excitement. They who have made resistance to the cause of truth under different standards, are following the example of the different Christian denominations, in respect to a general concentration of their power and influence. They begin to assume the attitude of a common enemy—they are taking the field with a bold and reckless spirit—their sounding manifesto is issued—and the warfare is waged against the truth, against the church. It is a question of deep interest to the church, what is to be the character, and what the qualifications of her standard-bearers. It is not enough, that cultivated intellect pours forth its remonstrances, and memorials, and able vindications of religious truth;—it is not enough, that the press issues its sheets of thrilling appeals, expressed in classic diction;—the pulpit must speak with more

fervid and commanding eloquence. It must thunder, as well as lighten, or it will not retain the influence and produce the effect it has done. There must be no cold indifference, no dullness and carelessness, in those who are set for the defence of the gospel. Let secular example be contemplated, and it will rebuke indolence and apathy in the service of Heaven. The Legislator hears his constituents reproached; or perceives, as he thinks, a treason-thrust aimed at the national confederacy. His spirit takes fire, and the voice of his eloquence commands a senate, and thrills through the country.

Let us not be understood as reflecting upon any of the venerable men, who now minister at the altar. We revere their characters, and confide in their talents, and rejoice in the success of their pious labors. We see among them a goodly phalanx, who have borne the burthen and heat of the day, and been nobly valiant in contending for "the faith once delivered to the saints." But we would see a Boanerges at every one of Zion's posts, whose powerful ministrations shall fill the sanctuary with attentive worshippers, and inspire a respect for the pulpit, that shall perpetuate and increase its important influences. We forget not, that carnal weapons are of themselves powerless, and that unless the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain. But God uses means; and the better they are adapted to the end in view, the more efficient and successful they prove. It is a fact, that pulpit eloquence greatly augments the power of the instruments which God employs in accomplishing his work. Whoever, therefore, can command this talent, though at the expense of much labor, is, in our judgement, under sacred obligations to attain and use it;—not to secure personal celebrity, but to persuade dying men to become reconciled to God.

Upon young men especially, who are commencing the work of preaching the gospel, or who are looking forward to the responsible service, we would urge this subject, as one that must not be neglected. They will have to sustain a conflict with error and wickedness, such as the church in this land has never seen. They cannot be too well disciplined, or too thoroughly prepared and armed for the crisis, to meet which they are summoned to the field.

LECTURES ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. *By Leonard Woods, D. D., Abbot Professor of Christian Theology, in the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Andover: Mark Newman. 1829. pp. 152.

THE three questions, Is the Bible true? Does it contain a Divine Revelation? Was it divinely inspired? have long agitated, and do still agitate, some portions of the community. We rejoice that each question in this ascending series is rapidly approaching an issue. For increased and brightening evidence in relation to the first, we look with confidence and pleasure to several sources;—to the recently published works of Wilson, Blunt, and others;* to the researches of Champolion, in decyphering the hieroglyphics of the Pharaohs, and reading another edition of Mosaic history among the antiquities of Egypt; and to the various revolutions on the other continent, which may be expected, ere long, to open hitherto unexplored depositories of ancient manuscripts, illustrative of the sacred pages. It is a striking argument in favor of the *truth* of the Bible, that its statements receive confirmation from almost every new discovery. This can be said of no false theory. Error is fated to run crooked, and to encounter new obstacles in every stage of its progress. But truth so completely harmonizes with surrounding objects, that the more extensively and diligently it is compared with them, the more is its agreement seen.

On the second question, Does the Bible contain a Divine Revelation? we are also favored with increasing light. As the Bible *asserts* its own heavenly origin, every new argument for its *truth*, is of equal force to prove its divine authority. The truth of the essential *doctrines* of the Bible affords additional proof of the same point. Some of these doctrines could never have been the discoveries of reason. If true, they must have been revealed. The heavenly origin of the gospel further appears in its *adaptation* to nature and the wants of man. This argument is daily receiving new illustrations, and accessions of strength. Scarcely a breeze blows from any quarter, which does not bring some cheering evidence of the adaptation of our religion to change the barren heath into a fruitful field, and make the wilderness blossom as the rose.

On the third question, Was the Bible divinely inspired? much light has been cast by the Lectures now before us. As the most of these Lectures have been presented to our readers, in previous

* Some valuable information, respecting ancient, oriental history, by which certain objections against the truth of the Old Testament are removed, will be found in Professor Stuart's *Chrestomathy*, vol. ii.

numbers of the Spirit of the Pilgrims,* an analysis of them will not here be expected. The author *assumes* the truth and divine authority of the Scriptures, and appeals to the sacred writers themselves, as competent witnesses of their own inspiration. The argument is ingeniously conducted, and we think conclusive. Objections will doubtless be made to it, but we have no fear that it will be overthrown.

There are those among us who think themselves believers, and who insist that others shall think as well of them as they do of themselves, who not only deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, insisting that they "are not a revelation," and "are to be regarded as possessing properly and purely a human character;"† but who also charge them with *imperfection* and *error*. "The sacred documents of our faith" were "prepared for temporary use," and are "filled with subjects of local interest, or popular accommodation." "The scheme of preparation which led the way to Christianity" (in the Old Testament) "is, for the most part, but dimly discerned, and *unsatisfactory* even in what is plainly to be perceived, mixed with the *doubtfulness of old traditions*, and with *systems of superannuated errors*."‡ "The words of Christ were reported from memory by the Evangelists, and *not always with perfect accuracy*."‡ "Neither the teaching of our Saviour, nor the influence of God's Spirit in enlightening the minds of the Apostles, preserved them from all the *errors* of their age, from the influence of all human prejudices and feelings, from all *inconclusive reasoning*, or from all *ambiguity, impropriety, and insufficiency* in the use of language."‡ "There are among our sacred books, *mistakes in philosophy, and discrepancies in statements of facts*."‡ In view of these and similar assertions, not unfrequently thrown out before the public, we may well expect to hear *objections* against the statements and arguments of Dr. Woods.

* The volume before us contains one Lecture on the "Manner of quoting from the Old Testament," and an Appendix of more than twenty pages, which were not published in the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

† Christian Examiner, vol. iii. p. 19; vol. v. p. 59; vol. vi. p. 344; vol. vii. pp. 347, 352. See also Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. pp. 14, 15, 95—100.

The Christian Examiner for May, 1830, the Number last published, contains further evidence of the estimation in which leading Unitarians hold the Scriptures. "Though they were written by inspired men, they are *not, in the common sense, inspired—they were not produced under the miraculous supervision of the Deity*."—"Do not they" (the sacred penmen) "write as those who are recording, in the usual way, events and sayings which were witnessed in the usual way"?—"We do not believe that the writer of the book of Acts either required or received divine inspiration, in penning the account of Peter's inspiration."—"We believe that the" events "*which they*" (the sacred writers) "*relate, with some trivial and natural discrepancies in their details, are facts*."—"It is impossible for any person of sense and candor to read the Epistles of the New Testament, and not perceive that several things in them are *merely the private opinions or commands of the writers*, and therefore are not of general or perpetual obligation, and of *no other authority than that of their own reasonableness*."—"We have dwelt thus long on this topic, because we are desirous that those who are least versed in questions of theology may understand, that a *denial of the immediate inspiration of the Scriptures* does not, in the slightest degree, affect their authority." pp. 138—143. Such are the most recent effusions of the Christian Examiner. Let the reader compare them with the declarations of the Apostles, 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 21; Gal. i. 11, 12; 1 Cor. ii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 13.

The writers of the New Testament positively assert the inspiration of the Old Testament. 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.' 'The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' What do these and the like declarations mean? Nothing more, perhaps, if we may believe Professor Norton, than that the Scriptures are "the works of men whose minds were acted upon by the motives which he (God) presents, and who had that sense of religion and duty which his dispensations to the Jewish nation were adapted to produce."* But it cannot be denied, that the sacred penmen sometimes wrote that which they did not understand, and which, nevertheless, was full of meaning. They sometimes wrote that which no unaided human power would have been able to discover. Of course, they were in some instances supernaturally inspired. And where is the evidence that they were inspired at one time, more than another? Does the expression, "*All Scripture*" is inspired, mean *some* Scripture is inspired? Facts, then, are against the hypothesis, that inspiration was *ever* the mere common influence of common motives.

We may also resort to the *usus loquendi*. What idea did the sacred writers convey, when they made the above declarations? This is the proper question before us, and we rejoice that it admits of a satisfactory answer. With the highest degree of moral certainty it may be proved, that these declarations conveyed to those immediately addressed, as much as this; *The sacred penmen were under an extraordinary, miraculous influence from God, so that what they wrote was, in matter and manner, infallible.* The idea intended to be conveyed was nothing short of *plenary inspiration*. A distinguished German divine,† has abundantly shown, that when these declarations of the Apostles were made, all nations (the Jews we may suppose more firmly than others) believed that particular men were inspired of God, and that the men thus inspired were *mere passive instruments on which God operated*. Thus Plato says of the poet, "*He does not speak of himself, but God speaks through him*"; "*He is transported beyond himself, and does not understand what he says.*" The Talmudists also assure us, that the prophets frequently did not understand the import of what they predicted. All the ancient world seem to have believed that their prophets and poets were under a positive divine influence. This was, perhaps, *peculiarly* the belief of those whom Christ and his apostles addressed. It was the actual, deep-rooted belief of the age. It was expressed very frequently in language not unlike that above quoted from Plato. Did not, then, the apostles know, that they should convey to their readers the idea uniformly con-

* Note to Norton's Edition of Locke and Le Clerc, p. 123.

† Dr. Knapp, whose valuable system of Theology is now in the American press.

veyed by such declarations,—the idea of a plenary divine inspiration? And can we believe that these now glorified apostles would have conveyed this fundamentally important idea with an intention to deceive?

We pass to another argument in favor of the inspiration of the Scriptures: Christ promised the aids of the Comforter to his disciples, ‘to guide them into all truth.’ From this we infer, that they wrote the infallible truth, under the influence of the Comforter. But we are told that this promise of Christ extends only to addresses before judicial tribunals.* In reply to this it may be observed, first, it is in the highest degree improbable that Infinite Wisdom should bestow assistance, when the less necessary, in temporary addresses, and withdraw it, when the more necessary, in permanent written instructions. Secondly, the apostles ascribe the same authority to their oral and written communications. And thirdly, the words of the promise forbid any such limitation. Without a hint of any intermission or exception, John declares, that the Spirit ‘shall abide with the apostles forever,’ ‘guide them into all truth,’ and ‘teach them all things.’

But who is this promised Spirit, this Comforter? “The Comforter,” says one, “that Jesus promised and sent down, is Truth.” Let us compare this interpretation with the Bible. ‘Take ye no thought how or what ye shall say, for *the Truth* shall teach you.’ ‘When *the Truth* is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even *the Truth*, which proceedeth from the Father, *he* shall testify of me.’ ‘Nevertheless, I tell you the truth: it is expedient that I go away; for if I go not away, *the Truth* will not come unto you.’ ‘Howbeit, when he, *the Truth*, shall come, he shall guide you into all truth.’ ‘*The Truth* shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.’

We ask again, who is this Comforter who should teach the apostles what they ought to say? “It is,” says another, the “*spirit of courage and holiness* which the gospel produced in their hearts,” and “that disposition which was the effect of their faith.” But what will be the language of the Bible, according to this interpretation? ‘It seemeth good to the spirit of courage and holiness, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden,’ &c. &c. After being forbidden by the ‘disposition which was the effect of their faith’ to preach in Asia, the apostles ‘assayed to go into Bythnia, but this disposition suffered them not.’ The gross absurdity of all such interpretations renders it necessary to revert to the received opinion, that the Comforter, or, which is the same, the Holy Spirit, is a divine person. What, then, was the nature of that assistance which he was to afford the disciples? Was it nothing more than ordinary assistance? the common operation of common motives? This, it is well known, is the

* Le Clerc, pp. 93, 74.

opinion of some. But it is an opinion, in the first place, entirely inconsistent with the true interpretation of our Saviour's promise. The words—'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you,' conveyed, as has been proved, no other idea than that of *plenary inspiration*. Did then Christ mean to be understood, or did he mean to deceive? The Scriptures prove that he *was* understood to predict a full inspiration; and the opinions of the earliest fathers show the same. They customarily speak of the sacred writers as the mere amanuenses of the Holy Ghost;* mere instruments for the emission of a given sound. We do not fully justify all their expressions on this subject; but they serve to exhibit the ideas anciently prevalent respecting inspiration, and the impression produced, in those times, by the phraseology of Scripture.

The opinion that the assistance promised by Christ was the mere ordinary assistance of Providence, is also inconsistent with the *spirit* of the promise. Christ was now leaving his beloved disciples, and they were overcome with sorrow. They had hoped, that the long-expected Messiah had appeared, and some had even dreamed of sitting on either hand of his shining throne. But all their sweet hopes are at once blasted, by an assurance of his death. Dismayed and discouraged by the prospect before them, their hearts are troubled, and their divine Master speaks to comfort them. What does he say? 'It is expedient for you that I go away.' But why? How expedient? In these circumstances are they to be satisfied with the cold promise, that the truths he had lodged in their minds should hereafter produce their legitimate effects? Whose soul does not chill at such a suggestion? What! could not the laws of nature operate, and truth produce its wonted effect, without their Master's leaving them? And what means he by saying, 'If I go not away, the Comforter will not come; but if I go, I will send him'? All this is senseless on the supposition here examined. We cannot, then, admit this supposition. We cannot doubt that our compassionate Saviour meant to give precisely the same encouragement which he *did* give; the cheering promise of a constant, efficient, infallible Helper.

Again, the idea, that the inspiration of the apostles and evangelists was the mere natural operation of Christ's preaching upon their hearts, is contrary to *fact*. The promise of Christ to his followers was fulfilled. But how? Before the day of Pentecost, it is implied that the Holy Ghost was not yet given; but on that memorable day, 'suddenly,' amid sounds, and rushing winds, and the appearing of cloven tongues, the apostles, 'all in one place,' were filled with the Holy Ghost.' The community were amazed.

* "Look into the Holy Scriptures," says Clement, "which are the true words of the Holy Ghost." 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xlv. This father commonly quotes the Scriptures by saying, "Thus saith the Holy Spirit." See chapters xiii. xvi. xxii. &c.

After this day, the Holy Ghost was often given by the imposition of hands. It was given instantaneously ; it 'spoke expressly ;' Philip was 'caught away' by it ; Ananias 'lied unto' it. Apply these representations to the 'natural effect of the gospel on the heart,' to 'Truth' ; and we shall have occasion to say, as well as others, that the apostles often fell into great "inaccuracies of expression." It appears, then, from the *letter*, the *spirit*, and the *fulfilment* of the promises under consideration, that *the Holy Ghost inspired the writers of the New Testament supernaturally, constantly, infallibly.*

The volume before us, to which we now return, is written in the usual style and manner of the author—serious, affectionate, clear almost to transparency, and without the appearance of affectation. It is characterized also by simplicity of argument. Some of our old theological writers were fond of heaping argument on argument, as if the solidity of a tower were proportioned to its height. But the author of these Lectures, instead of bringing before the mind a crowd of arguments, not one of which presents any distinctive feature, singles out from the group some of the more prominent, and urges them in a way to produce impression. Instead of going forth with an unwieldy and entangling armory, he wisely 'chooses him five smooth stones.' Considering, however, the great diversity of minds, it may admit a question how far this mode of reasoning ought to be extended. One man is affected by an argument, which has little influence on another.* We have ourselves been strongly impressed with the *confidence* of the apostles in the truth of their doctrines, and should be glad to see a greater prominence given to this topic. Take, for instance the expressions, 'Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which we have preached, let him be accursed :' 'He that despiseth' us, 'despiseth not man, but God ;' and the question occurs, What right have these men to set themselves up as the standard of perfection ? Men, just from the fishing boat, and from the ensnaring occupation of taxgatherers ; some of them the 'chief' of sinners ; and all the disciples of a man of sorrows ; what right have they thus to anathematize the philosophers who dissented from them ? *They knew that they were divinely inspired.* Without this knowledge, their strong confidence would have been arrogance, and could not be justified.

Another peculiarity of the Lectures before us is the removal of objections, before the establishment of the main propositions. And, in despite of rhetorical rule, we think the author exhibits much wisdom, in first freeing the mind from embarrassment, and thus preparing it for a steady contemplation of evidence. He expels

* Spinoza declared his willingness to believe the whole of revealed religion, if he could only be convinced of the raising of Lazarus ; but Mr. Yates says, that he would not believe the doctrine of the Trinity, even *if it were taught* in the book of our religion.

the mist from the eyes, before he presents the picture. And in removing the objections against revelation, Dr. Woods, we think, has been very successful. There seems to us a striking parallel between the objections against inspiration, and those against creation. A celebrated skeptic* suggests four objections against the creation of the world by a wise Being ;—1st, contrivances for pain ; 2d, government by general laws ; 3d, the frugality with which all our powers are bestowed ; 4th, the inaccurate workmanship of the whole system of things. Now, may we not reduce to these principles a great proportion of deistical objections ? The inspiration of men is contrary to our experience, says the Infidel ; so is the creation of the world, says the Skeptic. It would be degrading to the character of God to reveal many parts of Scripture ; † equally so to create many objects of nature. God never would have inspired a book which should be liable to corruption by men, says one ; neither would he create a human body liable to injury and irreparable disaster, says another.

Our readers will forgive us, if we dwell for a moment on one objection, which seems to deserve more than ordinary attention, because attempts are making to give it a force on common minds to which it is by no means entitled. We allude to the objection drawn by Le Clerc and others, from the alleged incorrectness of the received text. Dr. Woods has happily shewn the futility of this objection ; we wish to show the futility of the charge of *uncertainty*, which so many are disposed to bring against the manuscripts of the Bible. This charge is unjust, as well as disingenuous. For, in the first place, it can be satisfactorily proved that alterations in the manuscript copies of the Bible have been guarded against with astonishing care.‡ Who can reconcile such scrupulous

* See Hume's Dialogues.

† This objection, we apprehend, has been allowed far too much force. Even Parry supposes that the "inspired writers mention common occurrences" "without inspiration," "as any other plain and faithful men might do." Liberal Christians often appeal to those passages which declare apparently unimportant events, as *decisive* against our views of inspiration. But if we deny the inspiration of *one* passage, where shall the line be drawn, between that which is proper and that which is improper for God to reveal ? Locke happily compares the Bible to a telescope, which *aids*, not *supersedes*, the use of the eye ; and as the glass brings to our sight worlds undiscoverable by *unaided* vision, so does the Bible bring to our minds objects undiscoverable by our natural powers. How absurd, then, to refuse the use of this telescope, on account of the smallness of some of its screws, or the concealed use of some of its wheels ?

‡ That great care was taken in correcting manuscripts recently transcribed, is confirmed by the practice which prevails in Eastern countries, even in our own time. The transcriber reads over the newly made copy before a collection of learned men, each of whom follows the reader with his own copy of the same book, carefully examining whether what is read agrees with it. As soon as any disagreement is perceived, the reader stops, and a discussion takes place,—which is sometimes long continued." See Jahn's Introduction to the Sacred Books, pp. 124, 125.

The care of the Jews may be shown from the attempt of the Masorites to fix immoveably the Hebrew text. For several ages from the sixth century, they continued to collect observations on the "number of letters, words, and verses of each book ; its middle letter, word and verse ;" "the verses which contain all the letters of the alphabet or a particular number ;" "the verses which end with a particular form of a letter ; the words which have a particular letter in the middle ; and the number of times a particular letter occurs

care with the idea of the *uncertainty* of our Scriptures? But, secondly, it can be shown, that no important alteration of the sacred text *has ever been generally received*. Why does not some modern sectary alter the text of our Bible? The attempt would be instantly discovered and universally reprobated. So in ancient times. The Christian world was early divided into sects; and among the Israelites do we not read of Jews and Samaritans? All the existing copies of the Bible, particularly those in foreign tongues, would stand up as faithful witnesses against a modern corruption. And could an ancient sectary diffuse his corrupted passages through all the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Bible, and the numerous foreign versions? Impossible. "The Bible exists now, to all essential purposes, in its original purity." Its most imperfect copies clearly exhibit its fundamental doctrines. It is estimated that nearly a complete copy of the New Testament might be found in the quotations of only three writers of the third century. True, Kennicott, after an examination of 615 manuscripts and 52 editions, and De Rossi, after an examination of 731 manuscripts and 300 editions, have brought to light a huge congeries of facts; but these facts only multiply the original witnesses to the purity of our text, and put to eternal silence the charge of *uncertainty* preferred against it. With this evidence before us, we cannot but regard the attempt to unsettle common minds in regard to the Bible, and set them adrift on the wide ocean of conjecture, as unfair, unchristian, and even cruel.†

It has been somewhere said, that Infidelity, although ever the same in nature, assumes different appearances in different communities. It is like a fever, which some physicians tell us is one simple affection of body, but, from the various conditions of the systems which it attacks, assumes the various modifications of slow,

in the whole book." Jahn's Intro. p. 128. Mamonides mentions the following rules for copying the sacred rolls:—"Whatever is corrupt shall be burnt." "A book of the law wanting but one letter; with one letter too much, or with an error in one single letter, shall be considered corrupt." "No word shall be written without a line first drawn on the parchment; no word shall be written by heart, or without having been pronounced orally by the writer;" "no letter shall be joined to another," and "if the blank parchment cannot be seen all around the letter, the roll shall be corrupt." Carpenter's Popular Lectures on Biblical Criticism.

† Some late Unitarian publications on this subject, we think calculated to produce an impression on the popular mind decidedly *false*, and lamentably *injurious*. Might not our Saviour and his apostles have described the impossibility of having in *their* day a pure text of the Old Testament with the same zeal that these works exhibit in describing such an impossibility in *our* day? But how did these models of excellence describe the uncertainty of *their* text? 'Search the Scriptures,' 'the Scriptures cannot be broken,' 'All Scripture is profitable.' Do we find them using the language of a Unitarian tract; "The Old Testament 'cannot possibly have been preserved from a vast number of literal, verbal, and other errors'? And yet the same causes of error existed then as now. We will be the last to deny a free examination of Scriptural manuscripts; but we protest against communicating the results of our examination in a manner necessarily productive of incorrect and ruinous impressions.

intermittent, yellow, &c. In New England, Infidelity has attacked those who were previously diseased with latitudinarian views of the gospel. Who can wonder that it should here assume a peculiar appearance? We are much pleased with the antidote which Dr. W. has furnished for this dangerous malady. It is wise not to attempt the cure of a fever with a Galvanic battery. When we wish to convince, it is wise not to suffer our arguments to be obscured by the smoke, nor consumed by the flame of our feelings. We recommend most cordially the spirit of cool, cautious, and sure deliberation, which pervades the work before us. Above all, do we recommend the spirit of Christian dignity and gentleness which breathes through it. No severity of feeling, no precipitancy of angry passion, no harshness of crimination. Every Christian must rise from its perusal with his faith confirmed, and his benevolence enkindled. Every opposer of the doctrines and inspiration of the Bible, must confess that "right words" are "forcible," and that 'a soft answer turneth away wrath.' He will find in it nothing irritating, unless it is argument: nothing offensive, unless it is the candid, quiet, and manly temper of the Christian. We pray that the bland spirit of our religion, which breathes through these pages may be more generally diffused; and that its benignant influence may be more generally manifest.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE following creed is extracted from Lightfoot; Works, vol. ii. p. 383. This eminent Divine, after the most diligent research in the different departments of Biblical and Rabbinical learning, supposed these articles to be contained in the laws and institutions of Moses, and that they were for substance embraced by the ancient, learned, and pious Israelites.

ARTICLES OF A BELIEVING JEW'S CREED, COLLECTED OUT OF MOSES'S LAW.

1. I believe that salvation is by faith, not by works.

When the Talmudic Jews make such a confession, "The just by his faith shall live:" it is no wonder, if the more ancient and more holy Jews, under the law, looked for salvation, not by their own merits and works, but only by faith.

2. I believe that there is no salvation without reconciliation with God, and no reconciliation without satisfaction.

The first part of this article is so plain, that nature might teach it; and so might it the latter also.

3. I believe that satisfaction shall once be made.

This they might see by their daily sacrifice, aiming at a time, when there should full satisfaction be made, which these poor things could not do.

4. I believe that satisfaction for sin shall be made by a man.

This is answerable to reason, that, as a man sinned, so a man should satisfy.

5. I believe that he shall be more than a man.

This they learned from the common service about the tabernacle, wherein the high-priest, a man as fully hallowed and sanctified as man could be, for his outward function; yet did he offer, and offer again, for the people and himself, and yet they were unclean still. This read a lecture to every one's apprehension, that a mere man could not do the deed of satisfaction; but he must be more.

6. I believe the Redeemer must also be God, as well as man.

The disability of beasts to make satisfaction, they saw by their dying in sacrifice one after another; and yet, man's conscience cleansed never the better. The inability of man we saw before: the next, then, that is likely to do this work, are angels. But them Israel saw in the tabernacle—curtains, spectators only, and not actors, in the time and work of reconciliation. From hence they might gather, that it must be God dwelling with man in one person,—as the cloud, the glory of God, never parted from the ark.

7. I believe that man's Redeemer shall die to make satisfaction.

This they saw from their continued bloody sacrifices, and from the covenants made, and all things purged by blood. This the heedless manslayer might take heed of, and see that as, by the death of the high-priest, he was restored to liberty, so should mankind be, by the death of the highest Priest, to the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Their delivery from Egypt by the death of a lamb taught them no less.

8. I believe that he shall not die for his own sins, but for man's.

Every sacrifice read this lecture, when the most harmless of beasts and birds were offered.

9. I believe that he shall overcome death.

This Israel saw by necessary conclusion, that if Christ should fall under death, he did no more than men had done before. His resurrection they saw in Aaron's rod, the scapegoat, sparrow, &c.

10. I believe to be saved by laying hold upon his merits.

Laying their right hand upon the head of every beast that they brought to be offered up, taught them, that their sins were to be imputed to another; and the laying hold on the horns of the altar, it being a sanctuary or refuge from vengeance, taught them, that another's merits were to be imputed to them.

Thus far each holy Israelite was a Christian, in this point of doctrine, by earnest study finding these points under the veil of Moses. The ignorant were taught this by the learned every sabbath-day, having the Scriptures read and expounded unto them. From these groundworks of Moses, and the prophets' commentaries thereupon concerning the Messias, came the schools of the Jews to be so well versed in that point, that their scholars do mention his very name, Jesus; the time of his birth, in Tisri; the space of his preaching, three years and a half; the year of his death, the year of jubilee: and divers such particulars are to be found in their authors, though they knew him not, when he came amongst them.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE TRINITY.

Unitarians often class the doctrine of the Trinity with Transubstantiation, and insist that those who admit the former, ought not to stumble at the latter. The one doctrine, say they, may be supported by the letter of Scripture, not less than the other; and both are equally absurd. This objection to the Trinity was urged by Dr. Priestley, and has since been echoed by hundreds of others. The following reply to Priestley is from the pen of the celebrated Mr. Fletcher.

1. The question between Dr. Priestley and us is, whether there are three Divine Subsistences in the one Divine Essence. Now it is plain, that to deny this proposition, as reasonably as we deny that bread is flesh, and that wine is human blood, we must be as well acquainted with the nature of the Divine Essence, and of Divine Personality, as we are with the taste of bread and wine. But how widely different is the case, the Doctor himself being judge? Do not his Disquisitions assert, that the Divine Essence hath properties *most essentially different from everything else*—that of God's substance we have *no idea at all*—and that he must forever remain the *Incomprehensible*? Therefore, if God hath revealed, that he exists with the three personal distinctions of Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, the Doctor, after his concessions, can never deny it, without exposing at once his piety, his philosophy, his logic, and his common sense; unless he should make it appear, that he is the first man, who can pertinently speak of what he has *no idea at all*, and who perfectly comprehends what must forever remain *incomprehensible*. But,

2. The question between the Pope and us, with respect to transubstantiation, is quite within our reach; since it is only, whether bread be flesh and bones; whether wine be human blood; whether the same identical body can be wholly in heaven and in a million of places on earth, at the same time; and whether a thin round wafer, an inch in diameter, is the real person of a man five or six feet high. Here, we only decide about things known to us from the cradle, and concerning which, our daily experience, and our five senses, help us to bear a right judgement, agreeable to the tenor of the Scripture. Therefore,

3. Considering that the two cases are diametrically contrary, and differ as much as the depths of the Divine Nature differ from a piece of bread; as much as the most incomprehensible thing in heaven, differs from the things we know best upon earth;—we are bold to say, that when the learned Doctor involves the Protestant worshippers of the Trinity, and the Popish worshippers of a bit of bread, in the same charge of absurd idolatry, he betrays as great a degree of *unphilosophical* prejudice, and *illogical* reasoning, as ever a learned and wise man was driven to, in the height of disputation for a favorite error.

Do what you can, says the Socinian, you must either sacrifice the Unity to the Trinity, or the Trinity to the Unity; for they are incompatible.—But who says it? Certainly not our Lord, who commands all nations to be baptised into the one name of the Father, of the

Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And if Dr. P. says it, then he says it without knowing it; for, speaking like a judicious Philosopher, he has just told us, that probably the Divine Nature, besides being simply *unknown to him*, most essentially differs from the human in many circumstances of which he hath *no knowledge at all*. To this sufficient answer, we beg leave to add an illustration, which may throw some light upon the Doctor's unphilosophical positiveness.

Modern physicians justly maintain the circulation of the blood, which being carried from the heart through the arteries, flows back to it by the veins. But a learned Doctor, very fond of unity, availing himself of the connection which the arteries have with the veins in all the extremities of the body, insists that one set of vessels is more agreeable to the simplicity of the human frame. What! says he, Arteries! Veins! and lymphatic Vessels too! I pronounce that one set of uniform, circular vessels, is quite sufficient. You must therefore sacrifice the arteries to the veins, or the veins to the arteries; for they are quite incompatible. This dogmatical positiveness of the Unitarian Anatomist would surprize us the more, if we had just heard him say, that there are *many things* in anatomy, of which he has *no knowledge at all*, and assert, that the minute ramifications, and delicate connections of the vessels which compose the human frame, are, and must forever remain *incomprehensible* to those who have our feeble and imperfect organs.

From this simile, which we hope is not improper, we infer, that if positiveness on this anatomical question would not become the learning and modesty of a Doctor in Physic; a like degree of peremptoriness and assurance, in a matter infinitely more out of our reach, is as unsuitable to the humble candor of a Doctor in Divinity, as to the cautious wisdom of a Philosopher.

ON CHRISTIAN LIBERTY.

The following very just sentiments on the subject of religious freedom are extracted from a sermon, preached to the first general Assembly of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, after the two colonies of Massachusetts and Plymouth were by royal charter united, in 1692. They show that, although the first settlers of this country were not altogether free from the errors of their age in regard to liberty of conscience, these errors were soon shaken off, and better views were entertained.

Things will *go well*, when *magistrates* are great promoters of the *thing that good is*, and of *what the Lord requireth of them*. I do not mean that it would be well for the *civil magistrate*, with a *civil penalty*, to compel men to this or that *way of worship*, which they are *conscientiously* indisposed unto. He is most properly the officer of *humane society*; and a Christian, by non-conformity to this or that imposed *way of worship*, does not break the terms on which he is to enjoy the benefits of *humane society*.

A man has a *right* unto his own life, his estate, his liberty, and his family, although he should not come up unto these and those blessed *institutions* of our Lord. When a man sins in his *political ca-*

capacity, let *political societies* animadvert upon him ; but when he sins only in a *religious capacity*, societies more purely *religious* are the fittest then to deal with him. Indeed, in the *Old Testament*, the magistrate was an *ecclesiastical officer* ; and compliance with the *Mosaic rites* was that which entitled men unto the benefits of *Canaan*, the typical and renowned land. But now these *figurative* things have more *spiritual* things to answer to them. It may be feared, that things will not *go well*, when *heresies* are not exterminated ; but I pray, when (except once, perhaps, or so in the case of *Donatism*,) did *finer* or *gauls* ever signifie anything for the cure of *hereticks* ? The primitive church, for the first three hundred years of Christianity, cut off a thousand new *Hydra's* heads, without borrowing such *penal laws* as have since been used ; it was by *sound preaching*, by *discipline*, by *catechising*, and by *disputation*, that they *turned to flight the armies of the aliens*. Then 'twas that Christians did use to say, *non gladiis, aut jaculis, aut militari manu, veritas prædicatur, sed suadendo & consulendo*. Afterwards, indeed, the *orthodox* engaged the emperors unto severities upon the *hereticks* of those days ; but what got they by it ? When a wicked *Manichee*, a sort of *Quaker*, was put to death, an excellent historian says, '*Twas a most wretched example, and it made the heresie spread the more.*' Such prosecutions do but give a *principle*, which would be most fatal to the church of God ; yea, they do but afford a root for *Cain's club* to grow upon. These *violences* may bring the erroneous to be *hypocrites*, but they will never make them to be believers ; no, they naturally prejudice men's minds against the *cause*, which is therein pretended for, as being a weak, a wrong, an evil cause.—Wherefore, that things may *go well*, I would willingly put in a *barr* against the *persecution* of any that may conscientiously dissent from our way. Possibly the zeal in some famous and worthy *disciples* of our Lord among ourselves has been reported and reckoned, as having once had a little too much *fire* on this account ; but the churches of God abroad counted that things did not *go well* among us, until they judged us more fully come up unto the Apostolic rule, *to leave the otherwise minded unto God*. Nor would I desire myself to suffer *persecution* upon a clearer cause than that of testifying against our *persecution* of other Christians that are not of my own opinion. I am sure that things will not *go well*, as long as we incur the fulfillment of that awful word, *If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another*.

PALEY'S CHANGE OF SENTIMENTS.

Extracted from Bickersteth's Christian Student, pp. 356, 357.

Paley, in a Visitation Sermon, preached July 17, 1777, on the question, What the expressions in Scripture, regenerate, born of the Spirit, new creatures, mean ?—answers, ' Nothing ! that is, nothing to us ! nothing to be found or sought for in the present circumstances of Christianity ! ' It is very gratifying, however, to know that Paley's views materially changed on this topic before he died ; and that, among the sermons directed to be printed after his death, are the

following much more scriptural views of conversion. In a sermon on Matt. ix. 13, he says : ' Of the persons in our congregations, to whom we not only may but must preach the doctrine of conversion plainly and directly, are those who, with the name indeed of Christians, have hitherto passed their lives without any internal religion whatever ; who have not at all thought upon the subject, &c. &c. These persons are as really in an unconverted state as any Jew or Gentile could be in our Saviour's time. . . . These must be converted before they can be saved ; the course of their thoughts must be changed ; the very principles upon which they act must be changed ; . . . there must be a revolution within. A change so entire, so deep, and so important as this, I do allow to be a conversion ; and no one, who is in the situation above described, can be saved without undergoing it ; and he must necessarily both be sensible of it at the time, and remember it all his life afterward. It is too momentous an event ever to be forgotten. A man might as easily forget his escape from a shipwreck.'

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. WEST.

Of the last generation of ministers in New England, Dr. Stephen West of Stockbridge, Mass. was among the most distinguished. The following account of him is from a very useful work, lately published, entitled ' A History of the County of Berkshire, Mass.,' and will be interesting to many of our readers.

Dr. West was the son of Zebulon West, Esq., of Tolland, Conn., and was graduated at Yale College in 1755. After leaving college, he taught a school, and studied theology in Hatfield. He was licensed to preach by the Association of Ministers in Hampshire county, probably in the close of 1757, or the beginning of 1758, soon after which he was appointed chaplain at Fort Massachusetts in Adams. From that place he came to Stockbridge in November, of the latter year, and was ordained pastor of the church, June 13, 1759.

For several years, he communicated instructions, as his predecessors had done, both to the Indians and the English inhabitants. His common practice was to preach to the Indians on Sabbath morning, by an interpreter, and to the English in the afternoon. But as it was very difficult to obtain a suitable interpreter, and as the English rapidly increased by the accession of families from different parts of the country, and became capable of supporting the gospel themselves, Dr. West, in 1775, relinquished the instruction of the Indians, and with it the income received from the commissioners, to Mr. John Sergeant, son of the first missionary, who perfectly understood their language, and who had received a respectable education at Newark, N. J. The Indian professors, however, were not immediately separated from the church. They retained the same relation to the church and people as before ; but instead of receiving instruction from Dr. West through an interpreter, they received it directly from Mr. Sergeant in their own language. This state of things continued until their general removal to the township given them by the Oneidas, in 1785, when the professors among them, then 16 in number,

were regularly dismissed, formed into a new church, and Mr. Sergeant was ordained their pastor. The little church still lives among them, and has occasionally received some additions from the world. For a part of the time since their residence at Green Bay, they have enjoyed the labors of a missionary, and have been recently visited, in some degree, by the gracious influences of the Spirit.

When Dr. West was ordained in Stockbridge, there were only four settled ministers within the bounds of the county; the Rev. Jonathan Hubbard of Sheffield, Thomas Strong of New Marlborough, Adonijah Bidwell of Tyringham, and Samuel Hopkins of Great Barrington. Mr. Hopkins, afterwards Dr. Hopkins, was the nearest, and with him Dr. West contracted an early, intimate, and, as the result shows, a very happy friendship. The structure of their minds was somewhat similar. Both were fond of discussion and research. Dr. West was dissatisfied with what his predecessor, "Pres. Edwards, had written on the freedom of the will, and on many points relative to the distinguishing doctrines of grace." These became the topics of free and repeated conversation; and the effect was, that Dr. West gave up his hope of a personal interest in Christ, which he had long entertained, and which he had professed before men, and was convinced, that while he had undertaken the charge of souls, his own soul had been neglected. His conviction of sin was deep and pungent, and his solicitude was strong, and at times almost overwhelming. But the Lord was pleased soon to relieve him, to make him the subject of new views and affections, and to give him *a good hope through grace*. The reality and greatness of this change directly appeared in the solemnity, fervency and pungency of his preaching, and in the humility and goodness of his life.

Soon after this change, Dr. West preached a series of discourses, in which he dwelt extensively upon the character and government of God, and upon the dependence and accountability of man; the substance of which he published in 1772, in a work entitled "An Essay on Moral Agency." The fame produced by this essay, led many young men, designed for the holy ministry, to repair to him for instruction and assistance in the study of divinity. A succession of students from the New England colleges were under his care, for the space of thirty-five or forty years. These he boarded in his own family, where they had the benefits of his daily conversation and example, as well as his more formal instructions.

In preaching, he dwelt principally upon the doctrines of grace, the richness and excellence of which he had experienced in his own soul, and which he deemed all-important to the good of the souls of others. He was much in the habit of giving instructions in an expository form. During his ministry, he passed three times through the New Testament, expounding the sacred oracles, verse by verse, "with a propriety, acuteness and vigor," says a certain writer well acquainted with him, and a very competent judge on the subject, "of which this country has seen no parallel."

In 1792, the trustees of Dartmouth College conferred upon him the degree of Doctor in Divinity.

In 1810, such were his infirmities, that it was deemed important that he should have the assistance of a colleague ; and the Rev. Ephraim G. Swift was associated with him in that capacity, on the 26th of Sept. in that year ; after which the duties of the ministry were discharged by them jointly. Things passed on in this manner for some time to their mutual satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of the people. The Lord also blessed their labors. But difficulties at length occurred in the church, which rendered it necessary that the colleague should be dismissed ; and with a view to quiet the party feelings which then existed, Dr. West agreed to be dismissed also. Accordingly both were dismissed on the 27th of August, 1818.

After his dismissal, Dr. West was rarely able to appear in public. On the first sabbath in November and January following, he administered the Lord's supper to the church, and on the 10th of Feb. attended a funeral. After this, he was confined to his house, and generally to his bed, growing weaker and weaker in body and mind, until Saturday, the 13th of May, 1819, when he expired, in the 84th year of his age. His funeral was attended the Monday following, at which a sermon was preached by the Rev. Jacob Catlin, D. D., from Zech. i. 5.

Dr. West was twice married. His first wife was Miss Elizabeth Williams, daughter of Col. Ephraim Williams. She died Sept. 15, 1804, in the 74th year of her age. His second wife was Miss Eleanor Dewey, daughter of Mr. Daniel Dewey of Sheffield. She died in her native town, March 14, 1827, aged 73.

The courtesy and politeness of Dr. West, the effect of his good sense, his piety, and acquaintance with the world, were universally acknowledged and admired. All were made easy in his presence, while they regarded him with respect and love.

His mind, originally superior, was well disciplined, and greatly improved by science. At college, he had the reputation of a sound classical scholar. In the earlier period of his ministry, enjoying good health, and having but a small family, he applied himself intensely to study ; and indeed through life he was distinguished for industry and application. Hence he acquired a fund of knowledge. He had some acquaintance with the Hebrew of the Old Testament, was a good critic in the Greek of the New Testament, and read the Latin language with great facility. Other branches of knowledge were pursued, which were directly connected with his profession.

His acquisitions of knowledge, and improvement as a divine, were greatly promoted by the exactness and punctuality with which he prosecuted duty, doing everything methodically. One branch of service was never suffered to intrude upon another. All was anticipated and arranged, and his mind kept clear, and fit for vigorous and successful effort. He always kept several sermons written on hand, that he might not be driven to prepare for the sabbath at the close of the week. Fast and thanksgiving sermons were prepared weeks before they were used.

Though his passions were naturally quick and strong, they were kept under steady subjection. He possessed his soul in patience.

Scarcely anything ever ruffled his mind, or caused him to utter a rash or imprudent word. At the same time, tender emotions were very readily excited, upon the occurrence of anything interesting among his own people or in the Redeemer's kingdom. In reading the Scriptures, in prayer, especially when the Saviour was brought directly into view, he was often affected, even to weeping.

As a Christian, Dr. West was certainly eminent. All the graces shone in him, and some with distinguished lustre. His humility was continually noticed. The fact that he had once deceived himself, and entered the ministry without piety of heart, and his deep convictions, made impressions that were never forgotten. He seemed to count himself less than the least of all saints, because he had thus offended. Another trait to which this gave rise, was his marked and strong reliance on the merits of Christ for forgiveness and salvation; a reliance which was conspicuous in all his conversation, preaching and conduct; especially in his prayers, offered up through his death and intercession.

He had stated seasons for private communion with God. In the morning, after dressing and washing, he used to go to his closet almost as steadily as the sun arose. His season for private devotion in the evening, was a little after eight, when he used to retire, even if company were at his house, though he did it in such a manner that the reason of his withdrawing was not perceived by strangers.

In keeping the sabbath he was very strict. Having all his concerns previously adjusted, that his mind might not be disturbed on this sacred day, he was wont, when the sun went down on Saturday, to give himself to prayer for the blessing of God upon his own soul, upon his church and people, and upon the world. The day, except so far as it was taken up in family and public devotions, was spent in reading, meditation, and secret communion with God.

Though Dr. West read the Scriptures much, probably from early life, he gave them a more thorough examination after his conversion. Now in the prime of life, all the powers of a vigorous and cultivated mind, and of a renewed heart, were brought to an investigation of the truth as it lies on the inspired pages. The practice of giving expository lectures on the Sabbath, the superintendence of a theological class of young men, and another of young women, together with the instruction of students in divinity, living in his family and permitted to ask him questions at any time on subjects of doctrine and practice, conspired also to make him thus earnestly and habitually attentive to the sacred volume. Hence he became mighty in the Scriptures, and was able, almost beyond any other man, to unfold the meaning of the Holy Ghost. For many of the last years of his life, he read the Bible more than all other books.

The traits and habits which I have now mentioned, gave a heavenly cast to his conversation and conduct in his family, and to his visits among his friends and his people. The things of this world were little regarded, and a savour of divine goodness and wisdom continually attended him.

It is hardly possible that the preaching of such a man should not have been excellent. This excellence, however, did not consist so

much in the graces of style, as in lucid and forcible exhibitions of truth, applied to the conscience and heart. He was logical rather than rhetorical; though sometimes in his expository and extemporaneous performances, when warmed with the subject, he became highly eloquent.

As an instructor in theology, his attention was chiefly confined to what is termed Didactic Theology. A system of questions was given out on the great doctrines and duties of religion, on which the students read, reflected, and wrote. On their compositions, when read before him, he remarked, pointing out their excellencies and defects. He said comparatively little to them concerning biblical criticism, philology, and some other subjects, which are important to theological students, especially at the present day. His great object was to make them thoroughly acquainted with the system of doctrines revealed in the Bible; an object which his own preaching and conversation contributed not a little to promote. Many of them have been distinguished in the churches; among whom may be mentioned the late Dr. Spring of Newburyport, and the late Dr. Catlin of New Marlborough.

Dr. West ranks high among the writers of his day. His *Essay on Moral Agency*, first published in 1772, and republished with an Appendix in 1794, is a proof of very respectable talents and diligent research, and sufficient alone to establish his reputation as a metaphysician. His treatise on the Atonement, published in 1785, which has also passed through a second edition, has been highly approved by the most competent judges. Besides these larger works, he published a variety of sermons, and other smaller treatises.

But the greatest excellence of Dr. West yet remains to be noticed: he was wise to win souls to Christ. His preaching, after his conversion, was with power. He witnessed five seasons of special revival among his people, and during his ministry almost 400 persons were added to his church.

It was impossible that such a man should not have been extensively known. Peculiar circumstances also served to elicit and display his talents and graces. Settling in Stockbridge, while some of the southern, most of the middle, and all the northern parts of Berkshire were a wilderness, he had much opportunity for influencing the views, and shaping the habits of the new settlers, who flocked into the county in the early part of his ministry, from every quarter. He assisted in the formation of many of the churches, and had an important agency in introducing the orthodox confessions of faith with which these churches are now blessed. He helped to ordain the pastors of these churches, many of whom had been his pupils. He was often called upon in councils for settling difficulties, and was for many years standing moderator of the Berkshire Association. In all his services he displayed ability, acquitted himself with honor, and enjoyed pre-eminently the esteem and confidence of his brethren and of the community.

Among his more particular friends and correspondents were Dr. Bellamy, Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Edwards, and the Rev. John Ryland of Bristol, in England.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER ON UNIVERSALISM.

Since the publication of the Review of Universalism, in our number for April, a long article has appeared in the *Christian Examiner* on the same subject. The object of this article seems to have been to dissipate remaining fears and prejudices, and prepare the minds of Unitarians for further developements of Universalism in their own body. Accordingly many things are said of Universalism of a nature to give it currency and credit, and which none but Universalists would be likely to say. "Until the close of the fourth century, this opinion (Universalism) was held and avowed by *many* among the *most eminent Orthodox Fathers in the east*." "It was not until the fifth General Council, held A. D. 553, that the doctrine of a final restoration of the wicked was formally condemned as heretical by the supreme judicatory of the Catholic church."* Some of the "brightest ornaments and highest dignitaries" of the English church have been Universalists. "The doctrine of the proper eternity of hell torments has been gradually fading away before the *progress of civilization, and biblical and theological science*." Some "of the purest and best men that have ever lived"—men of "extraordinary attainments," and "of unimpeachable integrity and piety," who "would do honor to any cause," and of whom their friends would "have a right to be proud," are reckoned in the number of Universalists.†—Whether these assertions are true or false, it is not our intention at present to inquire. We look rather to the *purpose* for which they were made, and the real sentiments of those who have uttered them; and these certainly are too obvious to be mistaken.

Another means resorted to for preventing alarm, on account of the appearances of Universalism, is to state the views pretended to have been held respecting the future condition of the wicked under a variety of distinctions, imputing opinions to the believers of eternal punishment such as never were entertained, probably, by any human being. The effect of this manœuvre is, not only to cast a stigma upon the truth, but to unsettle the whole subject, throw over it an air of speculation and uncertainty, and dispel all definite apprehensions as to the future consequences of our actions.

Still, the more serious Unitarians, who are not yet prepared to make common cause with Universalists, may be alarmed, and something must be said to quiet their fears, and make them easy. Accordingly it is pretended that Unitarians are not Universalists, and there is no danger that they ever will be. "If any changes of opinion are taking place among the principal writers, or the junior ministers, they are of a kind to lead them still farther away from the belief, that the time will ever arrive, when all mankind will be saved *by an invincible necessity*, or when those who have sinned, and those who have not, will *stand on precisely the same footing*."‡ p. 262.

* Gibbon assigns, as one cause of the rapid spread of the Christian religion in the Roman Empire, that the primitive Christians insisted much on the doctrine of eternal punishment, and thus frightened people into a reception of their dogmas. They "delivered over, without hesitation, to *eternal torture*, the far greater part of the human race." Chap. xv. See how these unbelievers refute one another!

† See pp. 230, 229, 236, 237, 243, 245, 239, 247.

‡ A very singular phraseology this. Who ever charged Unitarians with holding Universalism as here described? We might almost say, who ever did thus hold it? May

The article concludes with the following declaration: "We look upon it" (the doctrine of eternal punishment, as held by Calvinists) "as beyond all question THE MOST HORRIBLE DOGMA EVER CONCEIVED OR UTTERED BY MAN."

HARVARD COLLEGE.

DEAR SIR,

IN reply to your last, in which you inquire if the time is "ever to come, when the sons of Orthodox parents may safely and properly pursue their education at Harvard College, and if so, what changes are previously to be desired," I observe, negatively, in the language of my former communication, "We do not claim that the College shall become exclusively Orthodox, or wish that it may fall under the entire influence of any one denomination. Unlike those institutions which have been founded by different sects for their own particular use and benefit, Harvard College is in *right*, and ought to be in *fact*, the COLLEGE OF THE STATE, where all the religious denominations may have an influence, and to which all may send their children, without the danger of their being perverted." With these views, we do not claim that there shall be an entire, or so much as a *general* change in the present curators and governors of the institution. But we do claim, to express it all in few words, that the College shall drop its *sectarian* character—that it shall cease to be a *Unitarian* College—that important appointments, instead of being confined to a single sect, shall be impartially distributed—that the institution shall no longer be held as the property, and subjected to the entire influence and control, of a single denomination. We claim that it shall be placed on such a footing, that Evangelical Christians may bestow their patronage, and greatly increase the number of students, without giving occasion for any to boast, "See how *Unitarianism* prospers! See how popular it is becoming, and how extensively it is likely to prevail"! That such would be the feeling, if not the language, of many, should Orthodox parents *now* fill up the College with their sons, is to me indubitable. By such a procedure, Unitarians would be encouraged, and strengthened, and more than ever determined to carry out the system of exclusion on which they have entered. This consideration proves, that a change in the state of the College is necessary, indispensably necessary, before the patronage of Orthodox Christians can with safety or propriety be bestowed.

But what change? In answer to this, I do not feel authorized, nor would it become me, to speak particularly. For your consideration, however, I will suggest two things in which, as it appears to me and to many others with whose views I am acquainted, a change is indispensable.

not a person be a Universalist, without believing that "all mankind will be saved *by an invincible necessity*?" without believing that "those who have sinned and those who have not," the redeemed and the holy angels, "will stand on precisely the same footing"?

In the first place, *Let the College, and the Theological School, be entirely separated.* If Unitarians wish an institution for the instruction of their ministers, we are willing they should have one. But let them take the same means to accomplish their wishes in this respect which other denominations are obliged to take;—let them found it, endow it, and support it. Let them not attach it to a College, instituted and endowed for very different purposes, and attempt to support it by a continued perversion of College instruction and College funds. The truth in regard to the Theological School at Cambridge* is, that it has no proper foundation of its own. It has derived, and is deriving nearly all its instruction and support from the College. In proof of this, I appeal to one of the publications of the American Unitarian Association. Speaking of the “course of study in the Divinity School at Cambridge,” the writer (Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood) observes,

“NO PERMANENT PROVISION IS YET MADE FOR ANY PART OF THIS INSTRUCTION. Dr. Ware is a *professor in the University*, and acts as College Chaplain; he cannot, therefore, devote much of his time to the students of the Divinity School. Professor Willard is also a *University Professor*, and has numerous duties in the College. Professor Norton” (*an University Professor*) “receives \$300 from the Dexter fund, and the rest of his salary from the general theological funds. Dr. Follen is *altogether paid from the College funds*, except one hundred and fifty dollars, which comes from the theological funds. Mr. Palfrey is to receive his compensation, of four hundred dollars per annum, from the rents of Divinity Hall. The provision for Mr. Ware’s professorship expires in ten years.

It is very desirable that permanent provision should be made for some part of the above instruction, as in that case the general theological funds would be relieved from the disbursement of sums, which might be applied to the increase of the theological library,† the building of houses for the instructors, and other needful purposes, and more ample instruction would be also secured.

Even more urgent, perhaps, is the want of a fund for scholarships. These are now in a measure supplied by annual contributions from churches in Boston and the vicinity. But from various causes this source is very uncertain. Two thousand dollars is an ample foundation for one scholarship.

There is wanted, also, the sum of *twenty thousand dollars*, to free the *Divinity Hall* from a debt to that amount, for money advanced by the trustees, for which interest is now paid.”

From this statement it is evident, that the Theological School at Cambridge could never have gone into operation at all, nor can it continue in operation on its present footing, independent of the instruction and support which it derives from College. Its situation is such, that College officers and College funds are made, in a great measure, to support it. The amount of instruction received from its connection with College could not, on a moderate computation, be provided, short of 3,000 dollars annually, which is the interest of 50,000. Not less than 50,000 dollars of College funds, of public property, is thus virtually made over, by the existing state of things, to the use

* If any persons entertain doubts as to the *character* of this school, let them listen to the following language of Mr. Greenwood, sanctioned by the American Unitarian Association. Tract No. 32, p. 18. “The cause of the Cambridge School, and the cause of rational religion and pure Christianity (i. e. *Unitarianism*) we sincerely hold to be ONE AND THE SAME. The prosperity of the former is intimately, perhaps inseparably, connected with the progress of the latter.”

† The College Library now answers the purpose, to a great extent, of a Library for the Theological School.

and benefit of the Unitarian Theological School. Now these things ought not so to be. And this unwarrantable connection must be dissolved—this Theological School must be cut loose from College, before the patronage of Evangelical Christians can be extended to it. Why should there be any more connection between Cambridge Theological School and Harvard College, than there is between Andover or Newton theological institutions and Harvard College? What better right have Unitarians to educate their ministers from the avails of public funds, than have the Orthodox Congregationalists or the Baptists?

The other change proposed to be mentioned, and which seems to me indispensable, is the restoration of the Hollis Professorship. This Professorship was instituted by a man, Orthodox in the technical sense, and for the permanent support of an Orthodox Professor, who should be “in communion with some Christian church of one of the three denominations, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or Baptist.” Under these conditions, the endowment was accepted, and a promise given that it should be faithfully applied. It is incumbent, therefore, on those who make and confirm appointments in Harvard College, as honest men, either to fulfil the design of the founder of this Professorship, or to abolish the Professorship and relinquish the fund. For the gross perversion which has been committed, and persisted in, in relation to this matter, I know of no excuse; and certainly (as I said in my former communication) I can do nothing to countenance it. Nor do I think it right for Orthodox Christians to patronise the institution, so long as this perversion continues. The other officers of College may be chosen, and perhaps ought to be, without regard to religious opinion; but the Hollis Professor of Divinity (if he bears the name of Hollis, or is supported from his fund) must be such an one as Hollis prescribed.

I might reply to your inquiries at greater length, but at present it is unnecessary. The time, I believe, will come—may it come speedily—when the regard which you feel for your *alma mater* may flow out towards her unobstructed, and when the confidence and patronage of Orthodox Christians may safely be extended to this ancient seminary. I have hinted at certain changes as previously indispensable: Let these be made in good faith, and none of the sons of Harvard will be found to exceed us in affection and zeal. But until they are made, the best which the excluded denominations can do for the College is—to withdraw. In this way, they will impress the necessity of change, and will undoubtedly hasten it.—In the mean time, there are other Colleges to which our sons may repair—Colleges blest with able instructors, with the faithful preaching of the gospel, and with the special smiles of Heaven. In institutions such as these, we may hope with confidence, and pray in faith, that God will meet our dear children, and bestow his grace, and prepare them for usefulness in his kingdom.

I am yours, &c.

CHAUNCY.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1 *Encyclopædia Americana* : A Popular Dictionary of the Arts, Sciences, Literature, History, Politics, and Biography, brought down to the present time ; including a copious collection of original articles in American Biography ; on the basis of the seventh edition of the German Conversations-Lexicon. Edited by Francis Lieber, assisted by E. Wigglesworth. Philadelphia : Carey & Lea.

This work is to be completed in twelve volumes octavo, each containing between 600 and 700 pages. The third volume has been recently published.

2 *The Works of William Paley, D. D., Archdeacon of Carlisle* ; comprising the additional volume of Sermons first published in 1825, with a Memoir of his Life. Complete in 6 volumes. Cambridge : Hilliard and Brown.

3 *The Works of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., Minister of the Tron Church, Glasgow* ; complete in one volume. Philadelphia : Towar and Hogan. 1830. pp. 469.

4 *Course of Hebrew Study, adapted to the use of Beginners*. By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Vol. II. Andover : Flag & Gould. 1830. pp. 204.

5 *A History of the County of Berkshire, Mass. in two parts* ; the first being a general view of the County ; the second an account of the several Towns. By Gentlemen in the County, Clergymen and Laymen. Pittsfield : Samuel W. Bush. 1829. pp. 468.

6 *The Life of Rev. Philip Henry*. By his Son, Matthew Henry, author of a Commentary on the Bible. Revised and enlarged. New York : John P. Haven. 1830. pp. 238.

7 *Pleasantness of a Religious Life opened and proved*. By Matthew Henry, Author of the Exposition of the Holy Scriptures. Boston : Peirce & Williams. 1830. pp. 168.

8 *Abolition of the African Slave Trade by the British Parliament*. Abridged from Clarkson. Together with a brief view of the present state of the Slave Trade, and of Slavery. In two volumes. Augusta : G. A. Brinsmade. 1830.

9 *A Sketch of Sacred Geography, for Sunday Schools, Bible Classes, and Families, with four elegant Maps*. By a Friend of Youth. New York : John P. Haven. 1830. pp. 140.

10 *Elements of Astronomy, Descriptive and Physical*. By Hervey Wilbur. Second edition, with an Appendix. New Haven : Durrie & Peck. 1830. pp. 144.

11 *Select Practical Theology of the Seventeenth Century*, comprising the best Practical Works of the great English Divines, and other congenial Authors of that age ; Collected and Arranged, with Biographical Sketches and Occasional Notes. By James Marsh, President of the University of Vermont. In five Volumes. Burlington : Chauncy Goodrich. 1830.

The first volume of this work, the only one yet published, contains "The Blessedness of the Righteous" and "The Vanity of Man as Mortal," by the Rev. John Howe ; and "Discourses on the four last Things," Death, Judgement, Heaven and Hell, by Dr. Wm. Bates.

12 *Moses on Nebo ; or Death a Duty : A Sermon* occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Joseph S. Christmas, late Pastor of the Bowery Presbyterian Church, New York. By Gardiner Spring, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church. New York : J. P. Haven. pp. 47.

13 *A Valedictory Discourse*, preached to the South Church and Parish in Dedham, Dec. 20, 1829. By William Cogswell. Boston : Perkins & Marvin. 1830. pp. 28.

"In this discourse," Mr. Cogswell proposes "to point out the way in which Individuals, Parishes and Churches, as such, may expect prosperity and happiness."

"Would a Society prosper," says he, "it should never interfere with the rights and immunities of the Church. It is for the welfare of both, that the privileges of neither should be infringed. The excellence of Congregationalism is, that the Church and Society live together as distinct bodies in partnership, and as independent bodies, co-operating in their proceedings. There is a reciprocation of civil and spiritual interests and influence embodied in Congregational polity."

14 *A Sermon preached at the Annual Election, May 26, 1830, before his Excellency Levi Lincoln, Governor, his Honor Thomas L. Winthrop, Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts.* By WM. E. CHANNING. Boston : Carter & Hendee. pp. 46.

The subject of this discourse is "*inward, spiritual liberty* ;" which Dr. C. makes to consist in "moral energy, or force of holy purpose, put forth against the senses, against the passions, against the world, and thus liberating the intellect, conscience, and will, so that they may act with strength, and unfold themselves forever." This "*spiritual liberty*," the writer says, "is the great gift of Jesus Christ," and "the supreme good of men ; and civil and political liberty has but little worth, but as it springs from and invigorates this." The means here proposed, "by which this spiritual liberty may be advanced," are "two ;—*Religion and Government.*"—We have not time or space to go into an examination of this discourse. Many of the observations, particularly under the head of government, are valuable. Others, more directly connected with the subject of religion, we think unscriptural and absurd—The writer is evidently improving in a point, which he often inculcates as one of great importance, that of reverencing himself.*

15 *The Fruits of the Spirit ; being a comprehensive View of the principal Graces which adorn the Christian Character.* By J. Thornton. First American from the fourth London Edition. Portland : Shirley, Hyde & Co. 1830.

* "Let the minister cherish a reverence for his own nature." Sermon at the ordination of Mr. Farley, p. 34.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

AUGUST, 1830.

NO. 8.

COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF
UNITARIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND.—No. VII.

DEAR SIR,

In my last, I was led to speak of the *concealment* formerly practised by the Unitarians of Massachusetts, as one of the means resorted to, to facilitate the propagation of their sentiments. The error crept in *secretly* among us, and the churches were corrupted unawares. I shall now call your attention to another circumstance, connected with the progress of Unitarianism in this region.

Those who have watched the measures and the publications of Unitarians cannot but have observed a want of *consistency* in them—a disposition to write and act according to *present* circumstances and feelings, without much regard to what may have been previously said or done. If this course has been adopted unconsciously, I can only say that it betrays a surprising lack of system, and of discernment, in those who have fallen into it. Or if it has been adopted with design, with a view to make the most of circumstances, and to be able to turn one way or the other, according as (at the time) should be thought convenient, it betrays a want of principle and integrity, for which artifice and management can make no amends. Or if those who have adopted the course described have been compelled to do it, in order to sustain a cause, to which they were committed, and which they were unwilling to abandon, still, the inference is scarcely more in their favor. The fact, that gross inconsistencies have been very common, in the measures and in the publications of Unitarians, is undeniable. In proof of this, I must be permitted to call your attention to a variety of particu-

lars. And if the statements about to be made shall have an unfavorable bearing upon some individuals, the fault will not be mine. I shall endeavor to use 'acceptable words,' give a true account, and quote their publications as I find them.

There was a time, as you may well remember, when Unitarians were the avowed enemies of *Foreign Missions*.^{*} They disbelieved, they pitied, they derided and opposed. But as the cause of missions rose in importance and in public favor, and events took place out of which something might, perhaps, be gained—suddenly the tone was changed, and the former opposers of missions became their warm advocates and friends. More recent events seem again to have chilled this ardor, and voluntary associations for Evangelical purposes have become the objects of suspicion and alarm.

The time, too, is within your recollection, when Unitarians were opposed to *Sabbath Schools*. So strong was this opposition in Boston, that an attempt was once made to prevent the schools from assembling in the public school rooms of the city.[†] But as Sabbath Schools continued to prosper, and children flocked to them, and it was found that they would rise and be successful, in spite of opposition, the opposition quickly ceased, and Unitarians became apparently as zealous in promoting Sabbath Schools, as they before had been in endeavoring to crush them.

Unitarians have ordinarily opposed religious meetings during the week, and especially meetings in the evening. One of their ministers, only a few years ago, published a sermon on the fourth commandment, the design of which was to show, that men are imperatively required to labor the whole of six days, and that it is as much a violation of the law of God to hold a religious meeting during the week, as to perform ordinary business on the Sabbath.[‡] But wherever meetings during the week, or in the evening, become frequent and popular, these scruples, it is observed, are easily dispensed with, and Unitarians can have their extra services and evening lectures, as well as others.

^{*} See *Christian Examiner*, vol. i. p. 182.

[†] At the instance of a Clergyman of this city, (who professes to belong to no party, but whose influence is uniformly exerted on the side of Unitarians,) an order passed in the School Committee of Boston, Dec. 1821, by which the school houses were closed against the Sabbath Schools. A very earnest appeal was immediately made to the School Committee on the subject, and in the Jan. following the obnoxious order was rescinded. Shortly after this, Sabbath Schools were, I believe, commenced in connexion with some of the Unitarian Societies.

[‡] This extraordinary sermon was from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester. In the course of it he says, "The duty of stated employment extends to *every portion of the six days*. We may not, therefore, *suspend* our weekly business under the pretence of attention to religious exercises not enjoined. In these cases, the question ever occurs, *Who hath required this at your hands?* The direction is *as imperative* to work six days, as it is to rest on the seventh. As we may not carry the labors of the week into the Sabbath, so we may not carry the rest of the Sabbath into the week" p. 12.—From the foregoing extract, it appears, that at the time of its publication, Unitarians in general had not discovered (what they now believe—see *Christian Examiner* for Sept. 1829) that the fourth commandment is not obligatory at all, and that the Christian Sabbath is not of divine institution.

Much reproach has been cast upon the Orthodox, on account of their holding meetings and promoting divisions (as it is said) in Unitarian parishes. This is a favorite theme of declamation at the present time, by which an odium is expected to be excited. But strange as it may seem, Unitarians are frequently intruding into the parishes of the Orthodox, and holding meetings, and endeavoring to gain proselytes. Unitarian minorities are also exhorted to separate themselves from the parishes of the Orthodox;* and separations of this nature have, in several instances, occurred.

If we turn now from the measures of Unitarians, to consult their publications, which is more especially the object which I have in view, the same inconsistencies will be observed.

It is sometimes alleged, that the Orthodox have fallen into great errors, and are fostering and spreading a horrible corruption of Christianity. But in other connexions, these appalling errors suddenly vanish, and those who retain them are regarded as differing very little, if at all, from their Unitarian brethren.—In 1815, a pamphlet was published by a noted “Layman” of Boston, entitled, “Are you a Christian or a Calvinist?” implying that a Calvinist is not a Christian. In this work, the views adopted by Calvinists are represented as “most false and pernicious,” “hurtful to general morality, opposed to the true character of God, tending to produce intolerable spiritual pride and bigotry in one class, often the least worthy, and causeless anxiety and tormenting oppression in another.” p. 57. But within only a few pages of this representation, Unitarians are spoken of as the “NATURAL ALLIES” of these Calvinists; “*allies*, who have no other end in view than *union and harmony* in the Christian church.” p. 60.

Unitarians have declared, that they regard the system of the Orthodox as being, in its *essential principles and tendency*, *opposite to the true spirit of the gospel*; and “that, if the influence of its peculiar doctrines, by themselves, should be fully imbibed, and permitted to operate uncontrolled, it would turn the fruits of the gospel into wormwood.”† They have declared that “transubstantiation is a less monstrous doctrine, than the five points of Calvin;”‡ and that the Orthodox make “representations of God, which every generous and honorable man in the community would shudder to have applied to himself.”|| But again they tell us that the two parties “may really *AGREE in all that is of essential importance* to religion and to salvation;” and that the difference be-

* See a long article on this subject in the Christian Register for July 23 and 30, 1825, in which various reasons are urged to show, that Unitarians, residing in Orthodox parishes, ought to separate, and support public worship by themselves.

† Hurlbut's Presumptive Arguments, p. 6

† Christ. Examiner, vol. iii. p. 76.

|| Unitarian's Answer, p. 8.

tween them "seems a question of arithmetic, rather than of true theology." "If we differ in one particular, we *unite in a hundred*. If our speculative metaphysics are at war, our practical morality, our evangelical spirit, may meet together and embrace each other. In all the great topics of Christian exhortation, *we are alike*."*

The late Rev. S. C. Thacher, in an article ascribed to him by his biographer, charges the Orthodox with "attempting to revive the *exploded absurdities of the dark ages*."† But in a sermon, written at a later period, he declares that "the differences between us and our fellow Christians" (referring directly to the Orthodox) are *chiefly verbal*.‡

The Unitarian Advocate, speaking of the controversy in this region, says, "It is a *great* controversy. It is not about the minor forms and features of religion. It is not about a church government or ritual. It is, in fact, about the *very nature of morality and piety*." "The *great questions* at issue are these, What is the true character, the real moral perfection of God; and what is the system of religious sentiments that truly illustrates his character and perfection? What is it to be a *good man*, and a *Christian*? What constitutes the true preparation of a moral being for happiness and God's favor, here and hereafter?" Vol. ii. pp. 229, 230. These questions are properly stated, and certainly they are radical questions, going to the foundation of all religion. But this same periodical, when apologizing for the concealment formerly practised by Unitarians, says, "Unitarians generally did not think those points of doctrine on which different opinions were entertained among Christians the *essential principles of religion*, those which men ought to be instructed in, for the sake of their salvation. They believed that a Trinitarian held *all the vital truths*, notwithstanding his errors." Vol. i. p. 190.

The inconsistency here pointed out, runs through most of the publications of American Unitarians. In nearly all their controversial writings, you will find the differences between them and the Orthodox represented, sometimes as very great, and at others very small; sometimes the Orthodox are charged with holding the most pernicious errors, and then again their errors dwindle almost to nothing, amounting to but little more than an exceptionable phraseology. This species of self-contradiction is very manifest in the writings of Dr. Channing. In his controversy with the late Dr. Worcester, he represents Trinitarians as holding "some of the *grossest errors*."|| Of Calvinism he says, that he considers it "as one of the *most injurious errors* that ever darkened the Christian world."§ He speaks of it as a "heart-chilling doctrine," "a

* Gilman's Sermon on the Introduction to John's Gospel. pp. 18, 20.

† Defence of his Review respecting the Andover Theo. Seminary, in Anthology, vol. vi. p. 205.

‡ Sermons, p. 288.

|| Remarks on Dr. Worcester's second Letter, p. 25.

§ Letter to Thacher, p. 14.

dreadful corruption of true Christianity.”* “Did I believe,” says he, “what Trinitarianism teaches, that not the least transgression could be remitted without an infinite expiation, I should feel myself living under a legislation *unspeakably dreadful*; under laws written, like Draco’s, in blood.” Unitarians “look with *horror and grief* on the views of God’s government, which are materially united with Trinitarianism.”†—Let us now compare these representations with some others made by the same writer. “The differences between Trinitarians and Unitarians are very often *verbal*.” “Ought distinctions so subtle and perplexing to separate those who love the *same divine character*, and respect the same divine will?”‡ “I have stated once and again that the differences between Unitarians and Trinitarians lie more *in sounds* than *in ideas*; that a barbarous phraseology is the chief wall of partition between these classes of Christians; and that, would Trinitarians tell us what they mean, their system would generally be found little else than a mystical form of the Unitarian doctrine. These two classes of Christians appear to me *to concur in receiving the most interesting and practical truths of the gospel*. Both believe *in one God of infinite perfection*; and we must remember that it is this perfection of God, and not his unknown substance, which is the proper object of the Christian’s love. Both believe in the great doctrine, that eternal life is the free gift of God through Jesus Christ. Both learn from the lips and life of Jesus the same great principles of duty, the same exalted views of human perfection, and the same path to immortality. I could easily *extend these points of agreement*.” “Trinitarians are apt to think themselves at an immeasurable distance from Unitarians. The reason, I think, is, that they are surrounded with a mist of obscure phraseology. Were this mist dispersed, I believe that they would be surprised at discovering their *proximity* to the quarter of the Unitarians, and would learn that they had been wasting their hostility on a band of friends and brothers.”||

Before leaving Dr. Channing, I must be allowed to hint at another of his inconsistencies. He sometimes represents Unitarians as very far from being confident of the correctness of their religious views. “Let us beware,” says he, “lest opposition and reproach lead any of us into a sectarian *attachment to our peculiar opinions*.” “Let us be willing to believe that we, as well as others, may have been warped in our opinions by education and situation, and that others may have acquired important truths, which, through weakness or prejudice, we may have overlooked.”§ “We

* Remarks on Dr. Worcester’s first Letter, p. 34.

† See Dedication Sermon at New York.

‡ Remarks on Dr. Worcester’s first Letter, p. 26.

§ Remarks on Dr. Worcester’s second Letter, pp. 22, 23.

¶ Letter to Thatcher, p. 28.

*dare not imitate the bold and positive language in which the darkest doctrines are sometimes urged as undoubted and essential.*** But in other connexions, this modest diffidence, this shrinking distrust, in regard to the correctness of received opinions, is exchanged for tones of the highest confidence. Unitarians “*always declare*, that Scripture, with one voice, *disowns* the doctrine of the Trinity : and that, of all the fictions of theologians, the doctrine of three persons in the one God has, perhaps, the least countenance from the Bible.”† “We ought to speak of religion,” it is well said in another place, “as something which we ourselves *know*.”‡

Unitarians sometimes represent the *truths*, the *doctrines* of religion as of very little consequence ;—and then again as of the utmost importance. “You will expect from me,” says a Unitarian minister, addressing his flock on the Sabbath following his ordination, “You will expect from me no detail of my speculative opinions. They are really of *too little consequence* to be brought forward at a period so interesting as the present. You know that I am a Christian.”§ Another gentleman, after having specified particularly most of the doctrines of the gospel, adds, “My individual belief in respect to the truth or error of these points can be of but *little importance*, and my subject no way requires that it should be given. *Neque teneo neque refello*. I believe that an innumerable company of Christians, who *never heard of these articles*, have fallen asleep in Jesus ; and that innumerable of the *same description* are following after.”|| But this same gentleman, only a few years previous, delivered an ordination sermon on the *inestimable value of truth*, as the only means by which men are sanctified. “We naturally infer,” says he, “in the first place, the *great importance of the truth*. It is the means that God, in his wisdom and mercy, has provided and employs for the sanctification of men. *To be indifferent whether religious truth or error, light or darkness, prevails among our fellow men, is to be indifferent to their best interests, present and future.*¶

It is sometimes insisted by Unitarians, that *sincerity* in our religious belief and character is all that can properly be required of us. “It is of little importance what a man believes or disbelieves, if he is only sincere.” This was a favorite and oft repeated sentiment several years ago. “One rule,” says Dr. Thayer, “shall measure the decisions of the great day. *Sincerity will be the test of character.*”*** But we are as positively told, on the other hand, that *sincerity is not sufficient*. “It is to be remembered,” says

* Remarks on Dr. Worcester's first Letter, p. 12.

† Remarks on Dr. Worcester's second Letter, p. 19.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Gannett, p. 14.

§ Rev. Samuel Cary.

|| See Dr. Eliphalet Porter's Convention Sermon, pp. 19, 20.

¶ Sermon at the Ordination of Rev. Charles Lowell, p. 14.

*** Dedication Sermon, p. 25.

Mr. Richardson, "that the *sincerity* of any one's faith gives no evidence that it is founded in truth, or is safe to be adopted."*

It was fully shown in my last, that the Unitarian clergy, in former years, were accustomed to *conceal* their peculiar sentiments. "We seldom, or *never*," says Dr. Channing, "introduce the Trinitarian controversy into our pulpits." "We have *never* entered into discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity." "They *touch*ed not disputed doctrines." "Though Boston was full of Unitarian sentiment and feeling, there was *no open profession of it*." Clergymen maintained a "*cautious reserve*," so that "neither from their sermons, their prayers, nor their private conversation," could it be inferred that they were Unitarians. They even considered themselves as *slandered*, if the epithet, Unitarian, was applied to them.† But more recently, a very different language, and an equal difference in practice, are observed. Concealment and disguise are strongly reprobated, and it is represented as of great importance that Unitarian doctrines be fully and plainly preached. "A cunning messenger," says Dr. Ware, "will temporize; and a timid one will palliate and each may be expected to practise somewhat of concealment and disguise;—will be tempted to inquire, not what is true, but what will be acceptable; not what duty demands, and the exigences of mankind require, but what they will bear, what may be said with safety, what will be heard without offence." This spirit the Dr. disapproves, and says that the minister must "deliver, *without fear*, and *without reserve*, the *whole scheme* of doctrine and duty which is revealed in the gospel."‡

Unitarians have insisted much on the happy *tendency* of their system, as a convincing argument in favor of its truth. Mr. Sparks published a volume, entitled "An Inquiry into the comparative *moral tendency* of Trinitarian and Unitarian doctrines," with a view to show the vast superiority of the latter; and the Christian Examiner, in reviewing this publication, says, "The point, on which the whole of the argument is made to turn in this book, is that which must, after all, *decide the controversy with the bulk of mankind*;—namely, the comparative *moral tendency* of the two conflicting systems." Vol. i. p. 223. This, it will be recollect-

* Sermon on Conversion, p. 27.

† For the authorities on which I make these quotations and assertions, see Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. pp. 117, 122, 123.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Brooks, at Hingham, pp. 5, 9. Dr. Ware was undoubtedly a Unitarian, at the time of his election to the Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College; yet, during the ten following years, it is presumed he never preached, frankly and openly, the peculiarities of Unitarianism. Did he, at this time, "deliver, without fear and without reserve, the *whole scheme* of doctrine and duty revealed in the gospel," as he understood it? or was he "tempted to inquire," "What will men bear? What may be said with safety? What will be heard without offence?"

I might refer to several ordination sermons in which the importance of a full and fearless exhibition of doctrine is inculcated. See particularly Dr. Channing's sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Gannett, and Mr. Nathaniel Whitman's sermon at the Ordination of his brother at Waltham.

ed, was the subject of Dr. Channing's Dedication Sermon at New York,—“The *fitness* of Unitarian Christianity to promote true, deep, and living piety.” But when a gentleman of Boston, some years since, renounced Unitarianism, on the ground of what he supposed its *unfavorable tendency and effects*, this grand argument was suddenly relinquished, and the American Unitarian Association issued a Tract to show, that the happy influence and effects of a doctrine, in promoting seriousness, deep feeling, prayer, a strict observance of the Sabbath, and zeal and effort in the cause of religion, were “no test,” no sure evidence, of its truth.*

Unitarians have, in some instances, announced themselves as a distinct denomination of Christians. In the first annual report published by the American Unitarian Association, it is said, “The want of union among Christians of *our denomination*, is felt to be a great evil by those who have directed their attention to this subject.” “The contributions of many of our friends have been thrown into the treasuries of *other denominations* of Christians, from the want of some proper objects among ourselves, upon which they could be bestowed.” pp. 14, 15. The Christian Examiner also says, “With the exception of *our own*, there is hardly a denomination of Christians, which does not support its newspaper, and its other periodical works, and support them well.” Vol. iii. p. 84. But on another occasion, the Examiner repels the suggestion that Unitarians are a distinct denomination, with great warmth. “What are we to understand by this?† That the liberal Christians are a *new denomination*? They are Congregationalists.” Vol. iv. p. 131.

A few years since, Unitarians were accustomed, almost invariably, to speak of themselves as a *sect*, a *party*, a *distinct class* of Christians. In the introduction to his Ordination sermon at Baltimore, Dr. Channing says, “I have thought it to be my duty to lay before you, as clearly as I can, some of the *distinguishing opinions of that class of Christians* in our country, who are known to sympathize with this religious society.” p. 3. “A minister who attaches himself to *that class of Christians* to which we of this religious society are known to belong,” &c.‡ “This house has been built by *that class of Christians who are called Unitarians*, and the gospel will here be taught, as, interpreted by *that body of believers*.”§ More recently, however, Unitarians seem averse to

* See Tract. No. 17. The Clergyman, who replied to “the Letter of a Gentleman of Boston,” says, that to decide “in regard to the truth or excellence of religious tenets” from “their *beneficial effects*,” “is a very mistaken ground of judging.” And again; “This argument for a system from *the character of those who hold it*,” is founded altogether in a mistake, and is of no weight at all.” pp. 15, 19.

† Referring to a remark in the Result of a Council at Groton.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Gannett. p. 17.

§ Dedication Sermon at New York, p. 2. For instances of a similar mode of expression, see Mr. Thatcher's Sermon at the Dedication of the New South Church; Dr.

being known as a class or party. They will suffer no opinions to be imputed to them, as a body; and their preachers are very careful to announce, that they speak as individuals, and of their own mind. "I am not giving you," says Dr. Channing at the Installation of Mr. Motte, "the opinions of *any sect or body of men*, but *my own*. I hold *myself alone* responsible for what I utter. Let none listen to me for the purpose of learning what others think." p. 2.

While Unitarians were willing to be known as a party, contradictory representations were not unfrequently made, as to the *size* and *extent* of the party. Sometimes it was represented as very small; and then again as very large. "Is it not notorious," says Dr. Channing, "that we have espoused an unpopular cause?" "Is it not notorious, that beyond a *narrow sphere*, our names are loaded with reproach?"* "Where," says a writer in the Christian Examiner, "where are the vast resources of Unitarianism?" "The resources are *not vast*, nor even *respectable*. When a purpose, strictly Unitarian, is to be accomplished, they, into whose hands it is committed, know full well, that the interest in Unitarianism, as such, is *small indeed*, and that its resources are soon exhausted." Vol. iii. p. 116. But the conductors of the Christian Examiner, in another place, insist that their party is not small. "Will this Council" (the Council at Groton) "as Christian ministers, dare to say, that in the Congregational church the liberal Christians are a *very small* party? *They know it to be otherwise*." Vol. iv. p. 132.

Unitarians have represented, long and often, that the Orthodox system was decaying and falling to pieces—that it had literally 'waxed old, and was ready to vanish away.' In 1806, it was a "frail and crumbling fabric."† Twenty years elapsed, and it was fast "wearing out. The human errors in which" it originated "had died away." Its "roots were perishing."‡ And though not yet entirely prostrate, it is represented as *now* "crumbling, in presage of a final overthrow."|| But from other accounts it may be inferred, that this wonderful system, so long in dying, is hardly likely to die at all. It is represented as full of life and vigor, and spreading itself far and wide. "The whole banded power of the country is Orthodox." "All the institutions for religious education in the country, with a single exception, are decidedly, and some of them assumingly, *popishly* Orthodox." A man "cannot travel toward any point of the compass, without being surrounded

Ware's Sermon at the Ordination of his son in New York; Mr. Lamson's Ordination Sermon at Danvers; and Sparks on the "Comparative Moral Tendency" of the two systems.

* Remarks on Dr. Worcester's first Letter, p. 13.

† Anthology, Vol. iii. p. 496.

‡ Christian Examiner, Vol. iv. p. 66.

|| Christian Examiner, Vol. viii. p. 320.

by Orthodox believers, Orthodox manners, and Orthodox exclusiveness.”*

I might proceed, in tracing out inconsistencies like those here mentioned to much greater lengths. I might remind you, for example, that while the doctrines of grace are continually objected to, as being of a *licentious* tendency, those who hold them are objected to, as being too *precise* and *strict* in their religious course. Again, I might point you to passages, in which it is virtually said, ‘If we *believed as you do*, we should give ourselves and the world no rest—we should devote all our time, influence, and property to the work of rescuing sinners from eternal woe;’† and at the same time to other passages, in which Unitarian doctrines are said to furnish even stronger motives to action than Evangelical doctrines, and in which the Orthodox are blamed for being officious, obtrusive, and *too much engaged* in endeavoring to promote the salvation of souls. But I can proceed no further—as I have already wearied myself and probably have wearied you.

The question occurs, How have inconsistencies, contradictions, such as have been noticed, been made to further the progress of Unitarianism? One might rather suppose they would be fatal to its progress, and cover its abettors with confusion. But however natural such a conclusion may seem on paper, in real life it is not verified. Most men will be pleased with what appears plausible at the time, especially if it comes from those who possess their confidence, and will hardly trouble themselves to inquire after contradictions, for the sake of exposing them. Of this trait in the human character, the promoters of Unitarianism seem to have been well aware, and of the advantages to be derived from it they have availed themselves to the full. They have seemed to write and act—I do not mean to judge them, but such is the *appearance*;—they have seemed to write and act according to circumstances, and with a view to present effect, without much regard to system, or to any other principle than that of advancing their own cause. When an odium is to be cast upon the Orthodox on account of their religious sentiments, then they are in the “*grossest errors* ;” but when a prejudice is to be excited against them, on account of their alleged exclusiveness, then the existing differences are little more than verbal. When their positiveness is to be re-proved, then it is presumption for any person to be confident of the correctness of his own opinions; but when decision and earnestness are inculcated, then “we ought to speak of religion as

* Christian Examiner, Vol. iii. p. 113.

† “We wonder,” says the Christian Examiner, “that anything is done for the temporal comfort of friends, where the doctrine on which modern missions chiefly rests, is believed. We refer to the doctrine that the whole heathen world are on the brink of a bottomless and endless hell,” “and that nothing can save them but sending them our religion. We see not how they, who so believe, can give their families or friends a single comfort, much less an ornament of life.” Number for Sept. 1829.

something which we ourselves know." When the value of Unitarian speculations is to be exhibited, *truth* is of vast importance; but when an indiscriminate fellowship is urged, then it is of little consequence what a man believes. At one time, the minister must "deliver, without fear, and without reserve, the whole scheme of doctrine and duty which is revealed in the gospel;" and at another, he must "not touch disputed doctrines," but in regard to certain topics, must "maintain a cautious reserve." Now, the happy *tendency* of Unitarian doctrines decides every thing in their favor; and then the superior tendency of a religious system, as manifested in its declared results, is no sure evidence of its truth. When Unitarianism is to be promoted in one way, its advocates are a distinct denomination; but when another way opens for its advancement, they are not a distinct denomination. When it is convenient for the clergy to speak in the name and on the behalf of their brethren, then they are a "class of Christians;" a sect, a body, a party by themselves; but when it is no longer convenient to be held responsible for one another's opinions, then the existence of a party is disclaimed, and individuals are alone answerable for what they have said and written.

But I need not recapitulate, as the subject is a plain one, and the instances I have furnished will enable you to pursue it, as you have opportunity. It is certainly very convenient to be able thus to traverse the field of argument, crossing one's own track variously and at pleasure, while good-natured friends admire and applaud, and declare that the course pursued is consistent and direct. There is, however, an attendant difficulty. What we have written may remain behind us, to be read by other and less partial eyes; and the artifices we have practised, and the contradictions into which we have fallen, will sooner or later be detected and exposed.

On the motives of Unitarians, whose publications and measures have been the subject of remark, I pass no judgment. I doubt not they are *sincerely* attached to their system, and feel authorised to resort to a variety of measures with a view to promote it. But what must be the character of a system which needs so frequent contradictions in order to its support? Can it, my dear Sir, be the truth? "Truth," it has been well said, "is always consistent with itself." Error *must* either be stationary, or "run crooked;" but the path of truth, like that of duty, is direct. Judge for yourself, then, whether Unitarianism, as here exhibited, bears the characteristic marks of truth.

Towards the abettors of this system, even the most zealous, I can detect no feeling which I think uncharitable. I regret their errors and consequent inconsistencies, and would fain hope that the statements here made, though for the time unpleasant, may lead ultimately to the indulgence of better views, and of

more enduring hopes. But whatever the effect may be upon them, we have obligations to fulfil to the cause of Christ, and to this community, with which we are not at liberty to dispense. An interested public should have the means of knowing where the way of truth and of safety lies, and to whom they may trust for direction in pursuing it.

INVESTIGATOR.

REMARKS ON ISAIAH VII. 14. "*Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*"

THAT Matthew quotes this passage, and represents it as receiving its fulfilment in the miraculous conception of Christ, is universally admitted. And the greater part of Christians, in every age, have understood it as a direct and explicit prediction of that mysterious event. It is well known, however, that the enemies of christianity, from Celsus down to the present day, have objected to such an application of the prophet's language, and asserted that it has no reference whatever to the birth of Christ. And some, whom it would be unjust to class with the enemies of religion, have so far harmonized with them, as to maintain that the prophet referred to a child that was to be born soon after he delivered the prediction; and that Matthew is to be understood as quoting his language by way of accommodation; or, at least, as applying to Christ what had a primary reference to a child that may be regarded as a type or symbol of him. I propose, therefore, to examine what has been alleged against *the primary and exclusive* reference of this prophecy to Christ.

I. It has been asserted, that the Hebrew word, here rendered *virgin*, may properly denote any young woman, married or unmarried, chaste or unchaste. But this assertion is in direct opposition to the authority of the ancient versions, to the etymology of the word, and to its indubitable signification in other parts of the Hebrew Bible. For in every other place where it occurs, it manifestly has the meaning which our translators have given it in the text.

II. There are others who, admitting this, maintain that the prophet's meaning is, that a young woman who was *then* a virgin, should, within a definite period, be married and bear a son. As this is probably the ground taken by most of those, who, at the present day, deny that this prophecy had a primary reference to Christ, I shall take the liberty to state some objections to it.

1. It is inconsistent with the context. The prophet encouraged Ahaz to ask a sign for the confirmation of what he had just predicted, and left it to his choice in what part of creation the sign should be exhibited. "Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above." And when Ahaz refused, the prophet, after reproving him for his perverseness, says, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son," &c. Does not this language necessarily imply, that there should be something *supernatural* in the event foretold? But according to the exposition which I am opposing, nothing was predicted as a sign but one of the most ordinary occurrences among men. For what event could be more common, than that a young woman, then a virgin, should be married and bear a son? But,

2. This exposition is inconsistent not only with the context, but also with the language of Matthew. "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that, which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost. Now all this was done, THAT IT MIGHT BE FULFILLED, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet. Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name Immanuel." Now whether the Evangelist considered this language of the prophet as a *direct* prediction of Christ, or not, it is evident that, in his view, there was a *striking correspondence between the miraculous conception of Christ, and the event foretold by the prophet*. But if the prophet did not predict a miraculous conception, where is the correspondence? In what sense could the miraculous conception of Christ be a fulfilment of the prophet's language, if his language did not import any such thing? To say that Matthew has applied the prophet's language by way of *accommodation*, is far from removing the difficulty; for the language of the Old Testament is never *accommodated* to events in the New, unless there is a correspondence between the events described. Thus, for instance, the language of God by Hosea respecting Israel, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," is by Matthew *accommodated* to Christ's being called out of Egypt. But here, the correspondence is striking. God had said of Israel, "He is my Son, my firstborn;" and in the character of a Father, had brought him out of Egypt. And thus the language admitted of an easy and natural accommodation to Christ, who was the Son of God in a far higher sense, and who was brought out of Egypt at the divine command. But if the prophet in the text did not predict a miraculous conception, then there is no analogy or correspondence between the event which he foretold, and that to which Matthew has applied his language.

3. To the exposition under consideration I object, that it renders nugatory the name by which this child was to be called.

Though I am far from supposing, that the name alone proves that he was to be God in our nature, yet it does prove that he should be some extraordinary person ; or at least, that he should have something more than a common part to act in the world. If not, why was this extraordinary name to be given him ? a name, which seems necessarily to imply, that God would be in a *special manner* with him, and make him the instrument of extensive good to his people ? But according to the exposition under consideration, there was nothing extraordinary, either in the intellectual powers, or the piety of this child, or in the part that he acted in the world. Those who give this exposition are unable to tell us who he was, or what he did ; nor have we any record of the fact that such a child was ever born. Grotius, indeed, supposes that a child of Isaiah's, whose birth is mentioned in the next chapter, was here intended. But to this it may be replied, first, that Isaiah's wife was not at this time a virgin, she having already borne him Shear-jashub, whom the prophet was directed to take with him on this occasion. And, secondly, the name of the child, who, as Grotius supposes, was meant, was not Immanuel, but Mahershalabaz. And, notwithstanding what he alleges to the contrary, there seems not the remotest probability that this child should be called by both these names, and yet no intimation be given of it in the Bible. But, thirdly, the child whose birth was predicted in the text, is in the next chapter addressed as though he were the proprietor or prince of the land. "The stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of *thy land*, O Immanuel ;"—a plain proof (in my view at least) that whosoever is meant by Immanuel, he is here recognized as the proprietor and prince of the land of Judea. Sensible of this, some, who are unwilling to admit that Christ is intended, have supposed that Hezekiah was meant ; but Hezekiah was born a number of years before the prophecy in the text was delivered ; and of course his *birth* cannot be here predicted. Nor does it appear that after this, Anaz had any son to whom this prediction could apply. Who then can this Immanuel be, if not the Lord Jesus Christ ?

It has indeed been objected, that it is difficult to conceive that he should be addressed, as the proprietor and prince of the land of Judah, 700 years before he was born. But where is the difficulty of conceiving this, if we admit his preexistence and Divinity ? In various places in the Bible, he is represented as the Ruler or King of Israel, whom they tempted in the wilderness, who conducted them into Canaan, and who afterwards protected them from their enemies. Why, then, might he not be addressed by the prophet, as present, and as the prince of the land of Judea, though his human nature did not then exist ? Is there any more difficulty attending such a supposition, than in supposing that a common child, a few months old, should be thus addressed ? But

such a supposition, those who deny that Christ is intended are compelled to make.

4. To the exposition under consideration I object, that it involves substantially the same difficulty which its advocates allege against the common interpretation. The great objection uniformly urged is, that the birth of Christ, which did not take place till more than 700 years after, could be no *sign* to Ahaz, that within three years the designs of his enemies should be defeated. For, say they, "In order that anything should be a sign of the fulfilment of a prediction, it must come to pass *before* the predicted event of which it is a sign takes place; and *its having thus come to pass must be known to him, to whom it is given as a sign; otherwise to him it is no sign at all.*" But how could such a birth as they suppose was predicted in the text any better answer the purpose of a *sign* to Ahaz, than the birth of Christ? Could it be to him a stronger confirmation of the predicted deliverance, to be told that a virgin, that is, some virgin in his kingdom, should, at some indefinite future time, bring forth a son? In order that this should be a sign to him, in the sense in which our opponents understand the term, it would be necessary, in the first place, that he should know the *time* when the sign given was to come to pass. They indeed *assume* that it was *known* to Ahaz that the child should be born within less than "three years." But the prophet gives no such intimation, and to take it for granted is to beg a main point in dispute. And, secondly, it would be necessary that Ahaz should know *the particular virgin* intended; otherwise, how could he know whether the sign given had come to pass,—since doubtless, many who were then virgins might, within "three years," bear sons. It may, indeed, be urged, that the name, Immanuel, would sufficiently designate the child intended. But not to insist on the possibility that more than one child, born about that time, might be called by this name, we may ask, Must Ahaz be under the necessity of searching his kingdom through, to ascertain that some virgin, referred to by the prophet, had brought forth a son, and called his name Immanuel? To avoid this difficulty, Rosenmuller supposes, that when the prophet uttered the prediction in the text, he pointed with his finger to *the particular virgin* that was to bear Immanuel. But this supposition is gratuitous and improbable. And if we might be permitted to make such suppositions, we could easily free the common interpretation of the text from all difficulty. We might, with Chandler, Poddridge, and a host of commentators mentioned by Poole, suppose, that when the prophet uttered the 16th verse, (which creates the principal difficulty in the way of the common interpretation) he pointed with his finger to Shearjashub, whom, say these critics, he was directed to take with him, "for no other imaginable reason, but that something remarkable was to be said respecting him." However

unnatural this may be, it is not more so than the supposition of Rosenmuller,—which, however, he considers as favored by the article being prefixed to the Hebrew word, so that it may be rendered, “*this virgin*.” But every one, at all versed in Hebrew, knows, that the article is frequently indefinite, and Gesenius assures us that this is the case in the text. (See his *Lexicon*, p. 163.) But, if it should be admitted that the article has here the definite signification, and if Rosenmuller may account for its being thus used, by supposing that the prophet pointed with his finger to a particular virgin; I may with more propriety account for its being thus used, by supposing that he referred to the well-known prediction in the third chapter of Genesis, that the Messiah should be “the seed of *THE* woman.” Why might not Isaiah designate the mother of our Lord by the phrase, “*THE virgin*” with as much propriety as his cotemporary Micah has designated her by the phrase, “*She which travaileth*.” See Micah v. 3.

I proceed to examine what Professor Stuart, who is the latest writer that has delivered his opinion on this text, has advanced. In his *Commentary on the Hebrews*, Vol. ii. p. 335, he says, “We know that in the preceding chapter, the birth of a child to be called Immanuel, and who was to spring from a virgin, was predicted, (vii. 14.) which birth was to be a proof to Ahaz, that within some three years, (compare verse 14, with 15, 16,) the land of Judah should be delivered from the confederated kings of Israel and Syria, who had invaded it. *Originally and literally*, this seems applicable *only* to the birth of a child within that period of three years; for how could the birth of Jesus, which happened 740 years afterwards, be a *sign* to Ahaz that within three years his kingdom was to be freed from his enemies? Such a child, it would seem, *was born at that period*; for, in chap. viii. 8, 10, he is twice referred to, as if then present, at least, as then living. In verse 10th, our English version has translated the proper name, Emmanuel, and, thus obscured the form of the original Hebrew.” He adds, on the next page, “The Emmanuel then born in an extraordinary way, and then, by his birth and name, a pledge of temporal deliverance to Judah from their enemies, might well be a symbol of him, who was to save his people from all their spiritual enemies, to bring in everlasting redemption, and whose name was in a much higher sense Emmanuel, God with us.” On this I remark,

1. That the application of this prophecy to Christ by Matthew is made in such decisive terms, that not only Prof. Stuart, but most of those who adopt the exposition which I oppose, are obliged to consider this child as a type or symbol of Christ. But in what respects could this child be a type of Christ? Not certainly, in the deliverance, of which his birth, according to the Professor, was a sign. For this bore no resemblance to the salvation, of which the birth of Christ was the pledge. It

was not a deliverance wrought by the special interposition of Divine Providence, but one which Ahaz bribed Tiglath-pileser to accomplish, and which was a calamity rather than a blessing to him and his people. It was a deliverance from the mouth of the wolf, that they might fall into the jaws of the lion. And hence, in 2 Chron. xxviii. 20, it is said, in reference to this very deliverance, that ‘The king of Assyria came to Ahaz, and distressed him, but strengthened him not;’ because, though he crushed the power of the confederate kings, yet his interference proved ultimately of no benefit to Ahaz, or his kingdom. And even if this deliverance had been a blessing, the child in question had no agency in bringing it about; and of course could not, in this respect, be a type of Christ, who is *the author* of the salvation of his people. Nor could he be a type of Christ in his lineage, or descent; for we have no evidence that he was of the family of David. Indeed we know nothing respecting him, except what is contained in the prediction before us. But if he were designed to be a type of Christ, is it not surprising that we should have no record of his birth, or manner of life?

Prof. S. seems to consider this child as a type of Christ, in the *name* by which it was foretold that he should be called. But no person was ever a type of Christ merely on account of the name that he bore, without regard to anything that he did, corresponding to the import of that name. Besides, it deserves to be considered what evidence, according to the Professor’s exposition, we can have, that Christ’s name is Immanuel. Our only evidence of this is the prediction in the text, and Matthew’s application of it. But if the child spoken of in the text was not Christ, then where is the evidence that Christ’s name is Immanuel? It will be of no avail to say that Matthew’s application of the text is a sufficient proof of this; for if this application proves that Christ’s name is Immanuel, it equally proves that he was the identical child whose birth was predicted by the prophet.

But it will probably be said, that this child was a striking type of Christ, in that he had no human father. But Grotius and Rosenmüller appear to deny his miraculous conception, nor is it certain that Prof. S. admits it. He indeed says of this child, that it “was to spring from a *virgin*,” and was “born in an *extraordinary* way;” which seems to imply that he admits its miraculous conception. But if he does, he contradicts what he has elsewhere advanced, and, in my view, involves himself in insuperable difficulties. In his Letters to Dr. Miller, p. 131, assigning the reason why Christ is called “the *only* begotten of the Father,” he says, “Is not that generation in the womb of the virgin, by supernatural miraculous power, and on account of which the angel says he shall be called the Son of God, the *only* generation of the kind which has ever taken place? Has God any other Son who was *thus* produced?”

The answer must be, Yes ; if a child was *thus* produced 700 years before. How, then, could Christ on this account be called "the *only* begotten of the Father," if, as the Professor maintains, his miraculous conception is the primary reason, why he is called "*the* Son of God?" I see not why the child, whose birth was foretold in the text, might not for the same reason be called *the* Son of God. But the idea that any child was in this respect like Christ, or was miraculously begotten in the sense that he was, appears, in every view in which I can contemplate it, so utterly improbable, that nothing but the plain testimony of Scripture could make me willing to admit it.

Indeed, if the child spoken of by the prophet was not Christ, I am unable to perceive any valuable purpose that could be answered by its miraculous conception. It certainly could no better answer the purpose of a sign to Ahaz, than the miraculous conception of Christ 700 years after. For the miracle was of such a nature that, for the knowledge of it, Ahaz must rely *entirely* on the divine declaration. And why might he not as confidently rely on this, if the miracle were to be performed 700 years after, as though it were to be wrought immediately? The *birth* of this child indeed, supposing him to know that it had taken place, would be to him a *visible sign*; but its miraculous conception could not. What purpose then could such a miracle answer? Will it be said, that it was intended to typify the miraculous conception of Christ? But is it probable that the Supreme Being would perform one miracle, merely to typify another of the same nature to be afterwards performed, especially, when the performance of the former would seem to interfere with his design in the latter, viz: that it should be "a *new* thing in the earth."

2. As a proof that Immanuel must have been born within less than three years from the time when the prediction in the text was delivered, the Professor tells us, that "he is twice referred to in the eighth chapter, as if *then present*, at least, as if *then alive*." To this I answer, that the prophecy in the eighth chapter was delivered the very next year after the prophecy in the seventh; and of course, if Immanuel were then born, he must have been an infant under a year old. Where then would be the propriety of addressing him and saying, (verse 8th) "The stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of *thy land*, O Immanuel," any more than there would be in addressing such language to a child to be born 700 years after; especially, if that child was to be united, in a mysterious manner, to him who was then "the King of Israel"? If this language proves that Immanuel was *then present*, it seems equally to prove that he had arrived to years of understanding, and also that he was proprietor or prince of the land; suppositions which are plainly impossible. And as to the 10th verse, on which the Professor has relied, I think the English version is correct in *translat-*

ing the Hebrew word Immanuel ; for if it is regarded as a proper name, the sentence appears imperfect and obscure : " Speak the word, and it shall not stand ; for Immanuel." But if we render it " for God is with us," the sense is clear. Thus also it is rendered by Bishop Lowth, who was certainly an able critic, and a competent judge in a case of this nature.

But if it should be admitted that the word Immanuel is here used as the proper name of the child whose birth was promised in the text, I am unable to see how it will prove that " he is referred to as *then* present, or as *then*" born. Why may not the prophet refer to the *promise* of his birth, as furnishing triumphant evidence, that the combined efforts of the enemies of Judah to destroy it should prove abortive ? ' Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces ; gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought ; speak the word, and it shall not stand ; for Immanuel is promised, and therefore the nation shall be preserved till he come.'

3. For further proof that Immanuel must have been born within less than three years from the time that the prediction was delivered, the Professor refers us to the 16th verse, which, in the common version is rendered, " Before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." But the translation of this verse given by Bishop Lowth, and which had long before been given by eminent critics, particularly by Ludovicus de Dieu and Castalio, appears to correspond more exactly to the original. " Before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land shall *become desolate*, by whose two kings thou art distressed." But when did this desolation of the land of Israel take place ? If we allow the prophet to be the expositor of his own language, we shall, perhaps, conclude, that it was not accomplished till about 65 years after, when " Ephraim was broken that it was not a people." But supposing that the land became desolate sooner ; still, the earliest date that can be fixed for its desolation is when the king of Assyria besieged and took Samaria ; (see 2 Kings, xvii. 5, 6.) which was fifteen years after the defeat of " the confederated kings." If, then, Immanuel was born before their defeat, he must have been capable of knowing good from evil before the land became desolate. But if he was not born till after their defeat, we may ask, in the language of the Professor, " How could his birth be a sign to Ahaz, that within three years his kingdom should be freed from his enemies" ? What, then, does he gain, by denying that the text is a prediction of Christ ? But,

4. If we should admit that the received translation of the 16th verse is correct, or, (which amounts to the same,) that the land became desolate, when " the confederated kings" were defeated

by Tiglath-pileser, still it will not follow that Immanuel must have been born before their defeat. For, in the first place, there is no certain evidence that his birth was designed to be (in the *strict* sense of the phrase) a sign or pledge to Ahaz, that within three years his kingdom was to be freed from his enemies." The prophet had indeed declared that their counsel against Judah "should not stand," and had directed Ahaz to ask a sign in confirmation of it. But he refused, under the pretence that it would be tempting the Lord; but no doubt from a secret contempt of the prophet, and a disbelief of his predictions. Jehovah, therefore, proceeded to give such a sign, or to foretell such a miracle, as his own infinite wisdom saw fit, and which, for aught that appears to the contrary, was intended, not to confirm the faith of Ahaz in the deliverance just predicted, (for probably he had none to confirm,) but to assure the pious remnant among the Jews, that *all* the designs of their enemies should be defeated, and the nation preserved under those dreadful calamities which the prophet immediately proceeded to foretell should be brought upon them by the king of Assyria. And what stronger assurance of this could they have, than a prediction of the birth of the Messiah? What right, then, have we to assume, that the event foretold in the text must have taken place *before* the overthrow of the confederate kings; and to assume it from the fact that it is called a *sign*? It is well known, that this word often signifies a miracle, where the idea of a sign or pledge of *the fulfilment of a prediction*, is entirely out of the question. Thus, the miracles which Moses wrought in Egypt are called by this name.

But if it were certain that the birth of Immanuel was intended as a *sign* that the counsel of the confederate kings "should not stand," still the inference drawn from it by Professor S. and others would by no means follow. For, in the second place, the assumption that whatever is foretold as a sign or pledge of the fulfilment of a prediction must necessarily come to pass *before* the predicted event of which it is a sign takes place, is entirely unsupported by Scripture. When God predicted to Hezekiah the destruction of Sennacherib's army, he said, "And this shall be a *sign* unto thee, ye shall eat *this year* such things as grow of themselves, and in the *second year* that which springeth of the same, and in the *third year* sow and reap," &c. (see 2 Kings, xix. 29.) But it is certain that what was here given as a sign was *subsequent* to the overthrow of the Assyrian army, which took place the same night that the prediction was delivered. And when God gave commission to Moses to deliver the Israelites from Egypt, in order to assure him of success, he said, (Ex. iii. 12.) "Certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be a token (a *sign*) unto thee that I have sent thee; when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall *serve* God on this mount." On this passage Scott justly remarks,

“The token announced was made, not to *sense*, but to *faith*; and therefore the sign was *consequent* to the event confirmed by it. As though God had said, I promise to meet thee and Israel at this mountain; this promise is thy assurance of success; depend on my power and faithfulness, and go, and bring them forth, nothing doubting.” Now, why may we not suppose that this was the case in the text? The prediction that the Messiah should be born of a virgin was the surest pledge that could be given to the pious, that the designs of the confederate kings, and of all their other enemies, should be defeated, and the nation preserved under those calamities, which the prophet foretold should be brought upon them. If God had such a blessing in store for his people, would he suffer them to be destroyed? If he would raise up the Messiah from the family of David, would he permit that family to be extirpated? And is it going beyond the truth to say, that the text, if understood as a prediction of Christ, would be a more satisfactory sign or pledge to the pious in Israel, than it could be, if understood of a common child to be born within less than three years from that time?

It has, however, been confidently asserted, that the language of the 16th verse as clearly implies that Immanuel was to be *born*, as it does that he was not to be capable of knowing good from evil, *before* the overthrow of the confederate kings. But where is the proof of such an assertion? With equal truth I might say, that the language of Micah, v. 3. ‘Therefore will he give them up *until* the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth; *then* shall return the remnant of his brethren,’ &c. as clearly implies that the Jews were *not* to be given up into the hands of their enemies *after*, as it does that they were to be thus given up *before*, the birth of Christ. But who does not know that they have been given up for a longer time and in a more remarkable manner *since*, than they were *before*, the coming of the Messiah? Nor is there any more difficulty attending Isaiah’s prediction of his *birth* in the text, than attends Micah’s prediction of his *birth-place*, in the chapter referred to. In both, the prediction itself is plain; and in both, what follows is attended with obscurity and difficulty. And I may add, this is the case with some other remarkable prophecies respecting the Messiah.

I have now examined all the objections to the common interpretation of the text, that have come to my knowledge. And however forcible some of them may be, I cannot think them unanswerable. Indeed I am persuaded, that whatever difficulties may attend the common interpretation, they are by no means equal to those that press on the one that has been substituted in its room. And the same principles of exegesis, that lead to a denial that the text is a prediction of Christ, would, for aught I can perceive, lead to a denial that there is any direct prediction of him in the Old Testament. For I scarcely know of a prediction of him more plain, or

applied to him in a more decisive manner in the New Testament, than this. And when we consider with what plainness the prophets foretold the remarkable circumstances of his birth, life sufferings and death, it appears truly unaccountable, that they should pass over his miraculous conception in silence, and that Matthew, in order to show that it was foretold, should be under the necessity of quoting a prediction, *that had no direct reference to it.*

IOTA.

THE NATURE, CERTAINTY, AND EVIDENCE OF TRUE
CHRISTIANITY.

THE following little tract was handed us by a friend, with the expectation that, if approved, it might be presented to our readers. It is entitled "The Nature, Certainty and Evidence of True Christianity ; in a Letter from a Gentlewoman in Rhode Island to another, her dear friend, in great *darkness, doubt, and concern*, of a religious nature." The following advertisement appears on the title page: "Though this letter was written in great privacy from one friend to another, yet, on representing that, by allowing it to be printed, it would probably reach others in the like afflicted case, and, by the grace of God, be helpful to them, the writer was at length prevailed on to suffer it, provided her name and place of abode might remain concealed." The letter is dated July 2, 1753, and was probably published soon after it was written. It was re-printed at Providence in 1793. With the omission of a few sentences, and with slight verbal alterations, we feel a pleasure in laying it before our readers,—that the excellent authoress, long since gone, we doubt not, to behold the face of her Redeemer in the heavens, may still dispense light and consolation to those who here walk in darkness.

Some, probably, will think that the writer expresses *too great confidence* in regard to her own piety. But on this subject several considerations may be suggested. And, in the first place, we must be permitted to inquire, whether Christians, at the present day, are not too fond of harboring and expressing doubts? Has not the language of doubt become so common, that some would even be alarmed, if they could not freely and in good truth adopt it? They would be led to doubt, because they had not (as they thought) doubts enough. We would be far from encouraging a false or an unseemly confidence ; but is the language of doubt, perpetually recurring, honorable to religion? Ought not Christians to love their Savior so well as to be satisfied that they love him? And are not expressions of doubt much more frequent now, than we have any reason to suppose they were among the early disciples of our Lord?

It should be remembered, too, that the letter before us "was written in great privacy," without a thought, at the time, that it would be seen by any eye, except that of the friend to whom it was addressed. It should be recollected further, that the writer was "not a novice;" that she had been long in the school

of Christ, and, so far as appears, had adorned her profession. So great is the deceitfulness of the human heart, that it might argue more of presumption than of piety, to hear the young, inexperienced believer giving utterance to his feelings in the language of strong confidence. Still less would such language become the lips of one, whose religious course had been of a doubtful, suspicious character. But it well became "Paul the aged" to say, "*I know* in whom I have believed, and *am persuaded* that he will keep that which I have committed to him against that day." And we rejoice to see tried, devoted, exemplary believers now, rising above their doubts, dismissing their fears, and claiming, with a strong but humble faith, their title to the promises.

My dear Friend,

I have thought much on those few lines you began to write to me, and do not at all wonder that you expect I should improve every opportunity to relieve you. For surely the strong bonds of friendship, with which we have for some years been bound to each other, (were there no bonds of grace at all,) demand this ; and how much more when these are added ? And truly, my dear friend, it has not been owing to want of tenderness and compassion towards you, under your distresses, that my tongue as well as pen has oft been silent. No ; my bowels yearned, and I longed to speak many times ; but your difficulties were such that I dare not open my lips, lest a subtil adversary should turn that against you, which I intended for your comfort, and sink your spirits the lower, as has sometimes, you know, been the case.

And will God now bless the poor weak endeavors of a worm to refresh you ! If so, it will rejoice me much ; but whether it please him to use a poor creature as an instrument or no, I am persuaded he will, in his own good time, revive you ; and I rejoice and praise him on your behalf, that through grace he will turn your captivity, and that he will bruise Satan under your feet shortly. For, blessed be God, Jesus Christ is stronger than he and all his combined legions : and he cannot resist his power, though he has audaciously struck at his honor, and endeavored to impede his blessed work in your soul. Has the bold-daring spirit presumed to insinuate that all religion is vain, imaginary, and delusive ? Does he pretend that none can know they are right ? Tell him he is a liar : God has declared him so ; and I am bold to say, I have proved him so. He has told me the same tale ; but, blessed be God, I do know that religion is no imaginary thing, but a substantial reality. I do know that there is a God of boundless perfections, truth and faithfulness, that will not deceive, no, nor forsake the soul that puts its trust in him.

But perhaps you will say, How do I know this God is mine ; and that I myself am not deceived ? I answer, by the evidences of a work of grace wrought in my soul. And now, as God shall enable me, my dear friend, I will tell you truly what God has done for my soul, and what I call evidences of a work of grace. This question I could never fully answer when with you, which makes me now attempt to explain myself.

First, then, I do know that God has, by his word and Spirit, convinced me of sin ; that I was by nature a child of wrath, an heir of

hell, an enemy to him and his ways ; yea, enmity itself—being averse to the gospel way of salvation wrought out by Christ. I plainly saw the cause of that complaint, ‘Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.’ God convinced me, also, that by the deeds of the law no flesh living should be justified, and that he and his throne would be guiltless, though he should cast me off forever.

Nevertheless, though I had thus destroyed myself, yet in him was my help. He discovered to me, that he had laid help upon ONE who is mighty to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him ; even a glorious Christ, the great Emanuel, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, one every way complete and suited to my wants ; and that he was not only thus qualified, and sealed, and sent by the Father, but that he was willing as well as able to accomplish the great work, and would by no means cast out any that come to him. Upon this discovery of the amiable and lovely Jesus, I do know that the Spirit of God constrained me to throw down the weapons of my rebellion, and to submit to HIM, as Prince and Saviour, and consent to be saved by him in his own way, and upon his own terms ; that he should be the Alpha and the Omega, the foundation and the top-stone in my salvation. Yea, God caused my heart to go out after him in strong and vehement desires, and to choose him in all his offices, with all his benefits, to be my portion forever. He appears to me to be the most lovely and desirable object ; and God enabled me to give myself, my whole soul and body, with all my concerns, for time and eternity, into his merciful and faithful hands : and had I a thousand precious souls, I would gladly venture them all with him ; for I am persuaded he will keep by his mighty power what I have committed to his charge ; nor shall all the hosts of hell be able to pluck me out of his hands. Upon this choice, and surrender of myself to Christ as Mediator, God the Father manifested himself to me, as my reconciled God and Father, the blessed Spirit took up his abode with me, afforded me his influences and assurance daily, and God made with me an everlasting covenant, never to be forgotten, even the sure mercies of David : and I solemnly gave myself up, all I have, am, or can do, both in life and death, in time and for eternity, to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be his own in a covenant way, to be disposed of as shall most consist with his glory ; and chose the glorious Trinity for my portion forever, in opposition to all others—even a God of infinite perfections. Oh happy choice ! Oh how happy, that I lived to see that day, wherein God betrothed me to himself in loving kindness and tender mercy !

And now the foundation of my hopes are laid upon the rock of ages. And agreeably to those covenant engagements, a faithful God has ever since dealt with me. And surely I can say, ‘Whereas I was blind, now I see ; old things are done away, all things have become new.’ Now, through grace, I dare appeal to a heart-searching God, and say, that none of his commands are grievous ; I esteem them all holy, right, just and good, and long to yield an universal obedience. God does excite in me strong and vehement desires after an entire conformity to his law, as though my whole salvation

depended thereon ; while at the same time he will not suffer me to depend on anything but Christ alone, notwithstanding a strong propensity to rely on my own merits, but enables me to account all things else as nought, in point of justification. Yet he gives me to see a beauty in holiness, which far exceeds the lustre of all created things. Nor do I know what desire means after any or all the enjoyments of time and sense, compared with those ardent longings which he at times excites in my soul after the enjoyment of himself, and for sanctifying grace.

And though grace is not always alike in exercise, (no, I am sometimes dull and lifeless) yet, blessed be God, it has been the habitual and settled bent of my soul for many years, to choose God, his Christ, and grace, for my portion, in all conditions, both adverse and prosperous. Sometimes he has bereaved me, cut off the streams of earthly comfort one after another, and then caused me to justify him, and fly to him as my all. Sometimes he has hid his face, and caused me to mourn after him, and refuse all comfort till he returned. Sometimes he has permitted Satan to tempt and tyrannize over me for a season ; and many a precious jewel has been stolen from me, by clouding my evidences, and insinuating that all was delusion and hypocrisy ; but a faithful God would not suffer me to be tempted above that I was able, but made way for my deliverance. Sometimes he has permitted the remains of indwelling corruption to rally all its force, and strive for mastery ; but at the same time stirred up an inveterate hatred and an abhorrence of it and myself for it, because it is the abominable thing his soul hates. And sometimes unbelief has so far prevailed, that I have cried out, I shall one day perish by the hands of these enemies ; or I shall at least fall into sins, to the dishonor of the dear name by which I am called ; but for more than sixteen years has God preserved me from allowed transgressions, and, by grace assisting, I am determined never to lay down my arms, but fight till I die, under the banner of the great Captain of my salvation. And since my Lord is mine, all is mine, and I shall come off more than a conqueror, through him that has loved me and given himself for me, though now I groan under a body of sin and death. Never does sin appear more odious than when I am well satisfied it will not prove my ruin. God disposes me to choose any affliction, or all the afflictions in this world, rather than sin. O that Christ would entirely possess his rightful throne in my soul, wholly sway the sceptre there, and fill every room ; that not a lust, an usurper, might ever dare to lift up its head again ! Transporting thought ! one everlasting day this shall be the happy case !

Again, God causes me to love his image, wherever I see it ; in strangers, in rich, in poor, in bond or free, of what denomination soever. Surely I do esteem the saints the excellent of the earth, and they are my delight. God also enables me to love my enemies, to forgive injuries, and earnestly to pray that God would forgive them also. But I must not enumerate more.

These, my dear friend, are what I deem evidences of a work of grace ; and for my part, I had rather be able to read them, than to

hear a voice from heaven, telling me I am a child of God. If you ask again, whether I can always, or of myself, read them to my satisfaction, I answer, Without Christ I can do nothing ; all my sufficiency is of God : but God has taught me to live more by faith, and less by sense, than I used to do ; and therefore if he hide his face, I do not immediately raze foundations as formerly, and draw up hard conclusions against myself ; but having treasured up the experiences of many years, I repair to them in a dark and cloudy day, and find thus and thus God has done for me, and appeared for my help in times past ; and this, as an anchor, holds me sure, that he will in his own time return, and revive me. He has begun a good work in me, and he will carry it on till the day of Jesus : he was the author, and he will be the finisher of my faith ; and so he makes me hang on the faithfulness of a covenant God, who will not deceive, nor make any ashamed of their hope, that put their trust in him.

And now, my dear friend, I have given you the reason of the hope that is in me ; and judge you, are these all the effects of nature, gifts, imagination, or a common work of the Spirit ? Will any or all of these thus determine the soul for God, and make it even break with longings after a conformity to him ? Will they cause it to cry out, Whom have I in heaven but thee ? and make it rejoice that nothing through eternity shall be able to divert it one moment from God ? Will nature abhor and dread hypocrisy, and cause the soul to tremble at the thought of it, and earnestly to plead with God to search and try it, if there is any guile, or reservation, or false way in it ? Will nature cause the soul to plead with God that his all-piercing eye may penetrate into its most secret recesses, and rejoice that it does so ? Will nature welcome death, the king of terrors, purely because it will deliver the soul from sin, and usher it into the presence of God ; when no outward difficulties make it desire death, but God in his providence makes things comfortable and easy ? Again, will nature cause all things below to appear as vanity, and less than nothing, compared with communion with God—cause it to deprecate and tremble at the thought of unsanctified prosperity ; and absolutely to refuse accepting of creature comforts, as any part of its portion, or in the room of sanctifying grace ? May not the soul in this case say, There is none upon earth I desire besides thee ; ordinances and providences are all empty without thee ; and I will not let thee go, I will not be comforted, except thou comfort me ? Yea, though thou slay me, I will trust in thee ; and, leaving the things that are behind, I am determined to press after as great discoveries of Christ, and degrees of sanctification, as it is possible for a mortal creature to attain in this imperfect state.

Surely this is a work of almighty power, and victorious grace ! May God have all the glory ! But methinks I see you wondering that I attempt to write in so positive a strain ; and withal, your tender heart misgives you, and you fear lest I am influenced by self-confidence, pride, ostentation, or vain glory. And would to God, I dare tell you that I had no remains of these odious sins in me ; but doubtless they will cleave to my best performances, as long as I

live in this world. However, these, I am sure, are not the motives which has constrained me thus freely to communicate my experiences to you : No, but to vindicate the honor and glory of the great GOD, whom Satan has dared to slander and reproach with his lies ; to bear a testimony for God, that I know him to be truth and faithfulness, and far to exceed all that I could ever ask or think ; and again to declare, that had I a thousand precious souls, I would venture them all on his truth, and cling to him. When God himself rends my hope from me, I will let it go, but not till then ; and if it is the hope of the hypocrite, may it go this moment. I know assuredly, it is by grace, and grace only, that I stand. For so weak am I of myself, that should he withhold his grace, I should wander from him to my utter destruction, notwithstanding all he has done for me. Whereof, then, have I to boast ? I rejoice that boasting is forever excluded. May the crown be set on Jesus' head, while I lay my mouth in the dust, and acknowledge I am an unprofitable servant, and utterly unworthy of all the mercy he has shewed to me.

I intreat you not to conclude, from what I have written, that I have any desire to establish assurance as the essence of saving faith, or to set up my experiences as a standard. No, no, far be that from me. I know God by his Spirit works variously with his children. But as to the essential and fundamental parts, I trust you will find them agreeable to the Scripture. Try them by that ; to the law and to the testimony ; if they agree not with that, reject them immediately, as false, delusive, imaginary, and having no light in them. But if you find they are genuine characters of a saving work, wrought by almighty power in the soul ; discern, I pray thee, whose signet, bracelets, and staff, are these. Can you not lay claim to them, and say, Surely God has done thus and thus for me also ? Or if you dare not lay claim, dare you deny and say, that God has not convinced you of sin and of your absolute need of a Saviour ? Has he not determined you for himself ? Do you not choose him for your everlasting portion ? Do not for a world say you do not : I trust you dare not say so. Well, if you ever have *chosen God* for your all, renew your choice ; fly to him again ; give up yourself, and all your vast concerns, into his hands, through the Mediator ; and I doubt not but you will derive strength from the Head of all gracious influences. Say not, you cannot do it, but try to stretch forth the withered hand, and it will be whole. Touch but the hem of his garment, and all shall be well. Lay your impotent, needy soul by the pool, and I trust the angel of the everlasting covenant will ere long descend, and make you whole, and restore to you the joys of his salvation. And thus, perhaps, you will see, though now they are clouded, that you have the evidences of grace in you ; that you do hate sin as sin ; that you do love holiness for its own sake, and God because he is an holy God ; that you love his law, and long perfectly to obey it ; that you do prize Christ as a King, as well as Saviour ; that you do love his image in his children ; that you do love your enemies ; are weaned from this world, and all its trifling enjoyments ; and that you are reaching after greater degrees of sanctifying grace.

I know you will forgive me, if I intrude on your patience in this long epistle, since it proceeds from a heart full of tender concern for you. May God refresh you by it, and lift up the light of his countenance upon you. And I beg you to pray for me, that I enter not into temptation : for though I have for some time, through surprising grace, walked up and down in the light of God's countenance, I am yet in an enemy's country ; a thousand snares await me from within and without : I have not yet put off the harness, and am perhaps comparatively but girding it on ; and though the house, built upon the rock Jesus Christ, fall not, yet I have no expectation but that the rain will descend, and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon it.—Oh pray that I may glorify God, in every condition and state of life, and all will be well.

This long letter I commit to your care and prudence, as the very secrets of my soul, and as a token of my sincere affection and esteem for you, as my very dear friend. Pray write to me as soon as you can.—Yours heartily,

REVIEWS.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.—*An Article in the Christian Examiner for July, 1830.*

THE discussion commenced in the first number of our present volume on the question, "What constitutes Infidelity?" has evidently been a very embarrassing one to some Unitarians in this region. It has drawn them out on the important subject of Inspiration, and wrung from them disclosures which have shaken the confidence of not a few of their friends.

In determining the question, "What constitutes Infidelity?" our correspondent pursued the following plain, and, so far as we see, unexceptionable method : Certain writers, whose names were given, had, by common consent, been denominated Infidels. What made them such ? What views did they hold and profess respecting the Bible and the Christian religion, which brought upon them the charge of Infidelity ? It was found, on examination, that none of them "avowedly rejected Christianity," or "treated the character of the Saviour with open irreverence or disrespect." Some "admitted that the Scriptures contained a revelation from God, and that particular portions were of divine inspiration ;" some were professors of the Christian religion, and observed its ordinances ; and some pretended to extraordinary zeal for the purity and advancement of this religion. Still, in the deliberate and

recorded judgement of the Christian world, they were Infidels. What made them such? What constitutes Infidelity? What are the characteristic marks by which to distinguish between an infidel and a Christian?—To these inquiries, the following answer was given :

“ The Christian receives the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as coming from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of his faith, and the rule of his conduct ; - but the infidel, whatever he may profess or pretend, never in reality does this.—The intelligent Christian is not averse to sober and just criticism, in application to the Scriptures. He wishes the canon of Scripture to be investigated and established, and that whatever is included in the canon may be properly explained. He wishes to possess a correct copy, if possible, as the inspired writers left it ; and he wishes this copy to be correctly interpreted, if possible, according to ‘ the mind of the Spirit.’ But when all this is done to his satisfaction, he has no further questions to ask. He receives it all. He says, with Chillingworth in his better days, ‘ No demonstration can be stronger than this : God hath said so, therefore it is true.’

“ But the infidel is not satisfied with having a correct copy of the Scriptures, and with having it correctly interpreted. He does not then bow to it, as a standard. There is a certain part of it, if not the whole, which, in his estimation, is not the authoritative word of God.”

The distinction here made was illustrated at considerable length, and the line of division between the Christian and the infidel was drawn with precision, and we think in its proper place. It was then shown, by quotations numerous and authentic from the writings of Unitarians in this country and in Europe, that they fall on the side of the infidel.

It will not be denied by any, not even by Unitarians whose works were quoted, that, according to the distinction established by our correspondent, they fall on the wrong side. If any objection is to be made, it must lie against, not the application of this distinction, but the distinction itself. It is incumbent, therefore, on those who feel themselves injured at being found on the side of the infidel, and who mean to persist in their opinions, to show that the proper line of distinction has not been drawn. It is incumbent on them to draw another, if they are able, which, in point of *principle*, shall place such men as Herbert and Bolingbroke on the one side, and themselves on the opposite. It was not said by our correspondent, nor will it be by us, that American Unitarians have followed out their principles to so great an extent as some of those with whom they are classed. But, in *point of principle*, where is the difference? Both call themselves Christians; both profess to believe that the Bible contains a revelation from God, and that particular parts of it may be in some sense inspired;* both are, in some instances, professors of religion, and come to its ordinances, and pretend to much zeal for its purity and advancement; and yet

* Passages may be quoted from both, which seem to imply as much as this, though both talk variously and inconsistently on the subject.

both refuse to receive the whole canonical Bible as the word of God, and bow to it as a standard of truth and duty. One class may receive more of the Bible than the other, or may regard it with greater veneration ; and there may be differences among individuals of either class in these respects. All may not apply leading principles in the same way, or carry them out to the same extent. But, in *point of principle*, where is the difference ? For ourselves, we cannot see where ; and if others have better eyes, or a better understanding of the subject, they will have the goodness, we hope, to inform us.

In relation to this whole argument of our correspondent, which is certainly a close one, and from which, as it seems to us, there is no escape, the reviewer in the Examiner has the following exclamation :

“What a notable argument is it, and what notable minds must it be expected to operate upon ! Unitarians believe some things that infidels believe, and use some of the same methods of reasoning ; therefore, Unitarians are Infidels !”

We should do the conductors of this work far greater injustice than we ever have done them, were we to suppose that they did not *know*, when they consented to the insertion of these and the following sentences, that they were nothing to the purpose—that they did not touch the argument in question, or constitute any proper reply to it at all. “Unitarians believe some things that infidels believe, and use some of the same methods of reasoning ; therefore, Unitarians are infidels” ! Was this the argument of our correspondent ? By no means. All Christians unite with infidels in the belief of a thousand things that might be mentioned ; but are all Christians on this account infidels ? Or are infidels to be identified with all sorts of Christians ?—It was inquired by our correspondent, first of all, “What constitutes Infidelity ?” and this being determined, it was shown, that those Unitarians, whose words were quoted, do agree with infidel writers, not in some indifferent things, but *in that very thing* which goes to make a man an infidel. They agree in pretending to respect Christianity, while they refuse to bow to the Bible as a standard, and receive it as the word of God. Such was the reasoning of our correspondent ; and it is much easier to pass it with a sneer, than to grapple with it, and fairly to answer it.

It is sometimes said by Unitarians, that the English infidels were driven off from Christianity by its corruptions,* and that, had they lived in this age and been familiar with modern improvements in theology, they would not have been infidels. Now this, with a difference of phraseology, is just what we have been saying. Were

* “Lord Herbert was indeed an extraordinary man, a man forced off and driven away from Christianity by what we consider as the corruptions by which, in his time, it was surrounded.” Norton’s General Repository, vol. i. p. 6.

Lord Herbert or Lord Bolingbroke now citizens of Boston, beyond question they would not allow themselves to be denominated infidels. They would resent such an appellation as highly as any of their peers. They would doubtless connect themselves with some Unitarian society, and might go to the sacrament at some Unitarian church. To be sure, they would not believe all that was in the Bible; they would pronounce some portions of it unreasonable, and throw them aside as no part of the revelation; and their religious teachers would do the same.

On the day of our publishing the communication on Infidelity, an article appeared in the Christian Examiner, entitled "The Scriptures not a Revelation, but the Record of a Revelation." Of this, we gave our readers some account in our number for February, pp. 95—101. In the Examiner for May, the subject was again introduced, in an article entitled "Misapprehensions of Unitarianism." A leading object of this article seems to have been to show, that, although Unitarians do deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, still, they are very serious in doing it, and are, on the whole, a very serious, religious people. From this article, some extracts were given in our last number, p. 370. In the article now under consideration, the conductors of the Examiner undertake to tell us, as they had done before, what they believe.

"We lay our hand strongly upon the foundation—the Bible. We say, *there* is a communication from heaven. *There* is light supernaturally communicated and attested to those heaven-commissioned prophets and apostles, who, in their turn, have simply, naturally, each after the manner of his own age, his own style, his own peculiar habits of thought and feeling, imparted it to us. *There* are truths recorded, beyond the human reach of the men who delivered them, and they are truths dearer to us than life.—Right or wrong in our conviction, this is what we believe."

Now all this is very well. A sense may be put upon these words which will make them express, perhaps, all that is necessary. A sense may also be put upon them which virtually nullifies them. And taken in connexion with all that has appeared in the Examiner on the subject, we are constrained, whether we will or no, to understand them in the latter sense. "*There*, is a communication from heaven." Where? *Contained in the Bible*,—to be culled out at the discretion of the reader. "*There* is light supernaturally communicated," &c. How much? How large a portion of the contents of the Bible was supernaturally communicated? Only a part, as we shall presently see, and this part to be determined by the judgement of individuals; so that we have no standard, after all, except our own understandings. And *to whom* was this light supernaturally communicated? To the prophets and apostles; and by them imparted to us, without any kind or degree of inspiration; so that we have nothing on which to rely, in regard to the correctness of the record, except the unaided fidelity and ability of the writers.—That these

are the real views of the conductors of the Examiner, no one who has read their pages can entertain a doubt ; and those who hold to the full inspiration of the Bible, and receive it as a perfect standard, can as little doubt whether views such as these go to nullify its declarations, and render the word of God of none effect.

The principal argument, in the several articles in the Examiner, to disprove the inspiration of the sacred writers, arises from the *manner* in which they wrote. Their " style is natural, and therefore is not supernatural." " The phraseology, the choice of words, the order of thought, the selection of figures, comparisons, arguments to enforce the communication, was altogether a human work."—Now we admit that the different writers of Scripture exhibit their characteristic differences of style. They were left, to some extent certainly, each to follow the bent of his genius, and to express his thoughts in his own natural way. The language is that of the age and country in which the writers lived, and we discover in each somewhat of the peculiarities of his own mind. So far, there need be no dispute. But what does all this prove ? That these writers were not guided and assisted in what they wrote by a directing, superintending, unerring Spirit ? Not at all. We are aware of no inconsistency, and we are confident that none can be made to appear, between the doctrine of inspiration, properly explained, and the fact that the sacred penmen communicated divine truth, each in that style and manner which to him was the most natural and agreeable. Admitting the fact of inspiration, we might expect beforehand that they would communicate after this manner, since, to secure such a manner, seems to have been a principal reason why *men* were selected as the instruments by which God should reveal his truth. Why did he not utter responses from a brazen oracle ; or speak in an audible manner from the clouds ? He saw it best, doubtless, that the communication should come to us through a human medium, and should possess, to our apprehension, the very property of naturalness which it does possess. And now shall we urge this intended and important quality to show that God had no concern in making the communication, and that men, the appointed instruments, were not inspired ?

The argument in the Examiner proceeds on the supposition, that what is supernaturally communicated must be presented in a style altogether unique and peculiar. There can be no appearance of naturalness, nothing seemingly human about it. If the style is natural, it cannot be supernatural ; and, *vice versa*, if it is supernatural, it cannot be natural.—Now let us examine this assumption, on grounds which the conductors of the Examiner themselves admit. They admit that some " portion of the Scriptures" was " written from *express dictation*"—the highest kind of inspiration possible. Let them, then, select these portions, and show us that the style of them is manifestly supernatural—altogeth-

er unique and peculiar—discovering no traces of having passed through a human medium. This certainly is incumbent on them, or else their argument must lose all its force, even in their own estimation.

Again, these reviewers believe that Christ was a human being, possessing a human body and soul, with all the faculties and affections of human nature. They profess also to believe that he was, in the highest degree, inspired—that the Spirit was given him without measure—so that whatever he spake was truly the word of God. Now, do they believe that the discourses of Christ were delivered in a style altogether superhuman—like the hollow responses of an oracle, or like a voice sounding from the skies? “A portion of the discourses of our Saviour,” say these gentlemen, “were [was] undoubtedly written from an *exact remembrance of the words*.” Let us then have these discourses selected (for no doubt our opponents will be able to select them) and let it be shown that they are supernatural discourses, in such sense as to have lost all appearance of naturalness, in “the phraseology, the choice of words, the order of thought, the selection of figures, comparisons, arguments,” &c.

There is no doubt, there can be none to those who admit the *truth* of the Bible, that no small part of it is literally the *word of God*. How very often is God represented as speaking—in the *first person*? How much of the Old Testament follows a ‘Thus saith the Lord’? These passages are numerous and long, embracing in some instances whole chapters, and they occur in every part of the Old Testament. Now if these passages are examined, they will be found to contain the same characteristic differences of style and manner, the same apparent ease and naturalness, which appear in other parts of our sacred books. The argument of these reviewers is therefore inconsistent, not only with their own concessions, but with facts. Consequently, it cannot be a valid argument. They may theorise as much as they will, and please themselves with the notion, that what is natural cannot be supernatural, and that what has the appearance of naturalness cannot be inspired; the facts in the case are against them, and may be urged to brush away their cobweb reasonings as fast as they spin them. Large portions of the Bible (if *true*) are in fact the word of God, for God is represented as personally speaking; and yet these portions present no more superhuman appearances than some other portions. They exhibit the same degree of naturalness, and the same characteristic differences of style.

It is urged by the reviewers in the *Examiner*, to keep themselves in countenance, that *others* have rejected the doctrine of inspiration; and several respectable authors are quoted as holding views similar to their own. But admitting that others have rejected the inspiration of the Scriptures; this will not prove that it is right

Wardlaw, after giving Dr. Priestley's views of the Bible, adds, "I like the honesty of this avowal; but I presume you will agree with me in thinking that Deism ought to have been the profession of him who makes it."* Mr. Fuller has a long letter on "the likeness of Socinianism to Deism," illustrated in the agreement of Socinians and Deists, "in their leading principles," their "prejudices," their successes, &c.† Dr. Jamieson, in the Preface to his "Vindication of the Doctrine of Scripture," speaks of the fatal influence of the Socinian scheme, in *throwing open the sluices to infidelity*; and of "the fascinating power which it invariably discovers, in bereaving its votaries of *all that distinguishes christianity—but the name.*" Dr. Miller says that "Unitarianism and infidelity are so closely allied, that he who embraces the one has really no good reason for objecting to the other."‡ Mr. Wilson denominates the liberal theologians of Germany infidels. "I open the works of the German infidels." "What are all the monstrous expositions of the German infidel school."|| Mr. Noble speaks of those who deny the Divinity of the Saviour, in the same manner. "Not only is absolute infidelity very prevalent, but the religion that is professed is more and more assuming a character which renders it different from infidelity less in substance than in name. The most low and unworthy ideas of the Christian Redeemer are daily superceding the honor that is his due."§

We present these authorities, to which others almost numberless might be added, for the purpose of satisfying our opponents that it is nothing new, or strange, or "monstrous" for those who deny the inspiration of the Bible, and refuse to receive it as a standard, to be denominated infidels. We call no man an infidel merely because his views differ from ours in regard to the person of the Saviour. We have never charged the conductors of the Examiner, or any other Unitarian, with infidelity, on such grounds. But we do call that man an infidel—we know not what else to call him—let his theological speculations be what they may, who *denies the inspiration of the Scriptures, and refuses to receive them as a perfect rule of faith and manners.* The readers of the Christian Examiner must judge for themselves whether some of the writers in that work have not brought themselves within the range of this definition, and fairly incurred the charge with which it stands connected.

But though these gentlemen do regard the Bible as a human composition, and many parts of it as of human contrivance, still

* Discourses on the Socinian Controversy, p. 160.

† Works, vol. ii. pp. 211—223. ‡ Letters on Unitarianism, p. 272.

|| Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, pp. 48, 332.

§ Lectures on Inspiration, p. 3.

they believe it *contains* a supernatural revelation ; and they ask whether “ any infidel ever admitted the divine, supernatural, miraculous origin of that system of interpositions and instructions that is recorded in the Bible ? ” In reply to this, we would merely inquire whether they do not regard Hobbes and Bolingbroke and Dodwell as infidels. But Hobbes, says Mr. Leland, “ seems sometimes to acknowledge inspiration to be a *supernatural* gift, and the *immediate hand of God.* ” Lord Bolingbroke says “ The Christian system of faith and practice was *revealed by God himself* ; and it is absurd and impious to assert that the divine Logos revealed it incompletely or imperfectly. Its simplicity and plainness showed that it was designed to be the religion of mankind, and manifested likewise the *divinity of its original.* ” Dodwell also represents “ the divine law ” as “ first *dictated by the Holy Spirit.* ”*

The conductors of the Examiner complain, that we “ take brief sentences, and disjointed members of sentences, here and there, from their writings,” and “ altogether suppress the strong and full declarations they make of their belief of a supernatural communication to the inspired teachers of our religion.” To this we reply, that we have quoted “ brief sentences,” and sometimes “ members of sentences,” from the Christian Examiner ; for the very good reason that we have not space, and if we had, we should have no necessity or inclination to extract entire articles. The proper question on this subject respects, *not* the extent of our quotations, but the manner of them. Have we quoted falsely or unfairly ? Have we quoted in a way to convey an erroneous impression ? Until *some instances of such quotation are pointed out*, it may be safely assumed that none exist.—But we “ suppress *altogether* the strong and full declarations they make of their belief of a supernatural communication.” Now this representation is untrue. Our readers know perfectly well, know it from the general course of argument adopted, and from the quotations we have made, that the conductors of the Examiner profess “ their belief of a supernatural communication to the teachers of our religion.” We have never attempted or wished to conceal this fact. Our endeavor has been that, along with the knowledge of such a profession on their part, our readers should have the means of estimating it.

Another complaint is, that we “ pertinaciously ” charge upon our opponents our own “ inferences as *their faith.* ” But this allegation, like the last, must be met with a denial. To the best of our knowledge, we have not done it. We have said that certain opinions expressed in the Examiner amount to a species of infidelity ; but we have not said or intimated that the conductors of that work admit the justness of our conclusion, or make it a part of “ *their*

* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. p. 5.

faith." On the contrary, it is implied in nearly all we have said, that this conclusion, however just, will not, on their part, be admitted.

Still another complaint is, that we "so completely wrap ourselves up, as to all the difficult points of this controversy concerning inspiration;" and we are called upon to tell our opponents "in good truth, what we do believe."—It will seem strange, we are sure, to many of our readers, that the Spirit of the Pilgrims should be charged with a want of explicitness. We had supposed, that we had excited prejudice and incurred reproach, more *on account of our explicitness*, particularly in relation to subjects connected with the Unitarian controversy, than from any other cause. If, however, in the opinion of these gentlemen, we have not been sufficiently explicit, we will endeavor to be more so;—and before telling them what we believe in regard to the subject of inspiration, it may be proper to remove some apparent misapprehension by telling them, in few words, what we do not believe. We do not believe, then, that a kind of inspiration or miraculous guardianship has been extended to our sacred books, to secure them against the mistakes of transcribers, or the mutilations of designing men. Errors, without doubt, at different periods, have crept into the text of the Bible; and it is of great importance that they be ascertained and corrected.—Nor do we think it necessary to insist that the sacred writers were guided uniformly by what has been called an inspiration of *suggestion*. We prefer not to descend to distinctions of this nature, but should rather say, with Dr. Knapp, that inspiration is "an extraordinary divine agency upon teachers, while giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught *what* and *how* they should write or speak;" or with Dr. Woods, "that the sacred writers were so guided by the divine Spirit, that in every part of their work they were rendered infallible, and wrote *just what God willed they should write*;" so that the Scriptures throughout may "justly be considered as *the word of God*."*

But we are called upon to reconcile these views of inspiration with certain things contained in the Bible; particularly with "the philosophy of Moses, the imprecations of David, the differences among the Apostles, the obscurities of Paul, and" with the "instances of puerility, coarseness, and indelicacy in style, and inaptness in illustration," which are thought to occur. Of the philosophy of Moses, as we know nothing, we shall say nothing. In respect to natural, visible objects, he was doubtless directed, and for the best reasons, to use the current phraseology, and write according to invariable appearances, without regard to any philosophical theory whatever. And we should as soon think of charging a writer with falsehood now, who should speak of the sun's

* See Dr. Wood's Lectures on Inspiration. p. 90.

rising, or of the sun's going down, or of the moon as one of the lights of heaven, as of preferring a charge of this nature against Moses, and arguing against his inspiration, on the ground that such language occurs in his writings. It is, we insist, *proper* language—the most proper to be used in the connexion in which it stands, and we should have deemed it a real imperfection in the Bible, had there been a manifest departure from the ordinary modes of speech, and an endeavor to shape its phraseology in accordance with the changing schemes of human philosophy.—Of the imprecations of David, we cannot be expected within our present limits to speak particularly. With the generality of Christians we may safely say, that while we do not think them inconsistent with the piety of the Psalmist, or with his inspiration, we do not regard them as an example for us. They are doubtless to be accounted for, on the ground of the peculiarity of David's situation, and the genius of that dispensation in relation to which he was called to act so responsible a part. He was the anointed leader of God's chosen, covenant people; a progenitor and type of Christ; and, what is more to the purpose, he was an *inspired prophet*, to whom the future doom of his enemies was miraculously disclosed, and against whom he was divinely commissioned to denounce judgements in the name of the Lord. Hence the imprecations which he uttered, so far from disproving his inspiration, would be of much more difficult interpretation, consistently with his piety and devotion, on supposition that he was not supernaturally inspired.

When the writer in the Examiner spake of “discrepances in the Evangelical narratives,” and “differences among the apostles,” we supposed, from the purpose for which these expressions were used, and the connexion in which they stood, that he referred to supposed contradictions, in the New Testament. For if not contradictions, how could they render the inference “*unavoidable*, that these writings,” (the sacred writings,) “so far as their composition is concerned, are to be regarded as possessing a properly and purely human character?” Vol. vii. p. 352. But in the article before us, these “discrepancies” and “differences” are explained to mean no more than this, that the Evangelical narratives, though perfectly reconcileable, are not couched in precisely the same terms; and that the apostles, in some instances, had the misfortune to judge differently of men and things—a sense which no Christian ever thought of disputing, and to which no infidel could with propriety appeal, as constituting an objection to the inspiration of the New Testament.

As to “the obscurities of Paul,” and “the instances of puerility, coarseness, and indelicacy of style, and inappositeness in illustration,” which the conductors of the Examiner think they find in the Bible, and respecting which they wish to know our views, we say at

once, that in the writings of Paul, there "are some things hard to be understood," not, however, because he wrote improperly, or without inspiration, but because of the peculiar circumstances under which he wrote, and the nature of the subjects of which he was called to treat. We know of no parts of the Bible which we should dare to characterize as puerile, or coarse, or inapposite, or on the whole indelicate. They may seem so to our ears and tastes; but we ought to remember that the tastes of different ages and nations differ in this respect; that what would be sufficiently delicate to an Oriental now, and would have been so regarded by our own fathers and mothers two hundred years ago, may strike us very differently; that what we esteem our superior delicacy may be chiefly owing to greater impurity in our mental associations; and, in fine, that we have need to know much more than we do, before we presume to sit in judgement on the style of a book prepared for all ages, past and to come, designed to be read in future by all people, and intended to answer so many and high purposes, as the Bible. And language respecting this holy book, like that here quoted, we can but think indecent and irreverent, such as no believer in divine inspiration would be willing to employ, and furnishing strong evidence in proof of the charge to support which it was originally quoted.

Thus much we have deemed it necessary to say in reply to the queries of the Examiner, and to the charge of wrapping ourselves up as to all the difficult points of this controversy—a charge which we never thought of deserving, and which, could we have consented to deserve, we probably might have escaped much of the reproach which has been cast upon us by these reviewers.

We find several objections urged against the inspiration of the Scriptures, to which, in passing, we must give a moment's attention. It is said, that there are trivial and seemingly unimportant things in the Bible, which it would be dishonorable to the Deity to regard as having come from him. And are there not trivial and seemingly unimportant things in nature? Is not the world around us made up, to a great extent, of little things, to many of which, separately considered, we can scarcely conceive why the Creator should have given existence? Yet who would urge their littleness against the abounding evidence that he created them? Or who will urge the seemingly little things which we find in the Bible to confront the direct testimony of the writers, that "*all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God?"

It is further objected that, with our views of inspiration, we ought not to be satisfied with translations of the Bible. "How is it possible for our opponents, on their principles, to rely, as they do, on uninspired translations of the sacred text?"—But suppose we deny inspiration, and regard the Bible as a mere human composition; would a translation in that case be any more safe than it is at pres-

ent? Cannot an inspired book be translated as well as one that is uninspired?—But we must have an *infallible* standard. And so we have, in the *original* Scriptures; and in translations, so far as they agree with the original, and no farther. Admitting, then, that there may be some uncertainty about translations; would there be less uncertainty, if the original were not perfect; or would there be more? And because we cannot have all that would be desirable in translations, shall we utterly reject them? The fact that translations must be uninspired, and may be imperfect, evidently shows the importance, rather than otherwise, of having an *inspired* and infallible original.

But “human language,” it is said, “is essentially fallible;” “words are but conventional signs of thought;” so that it is impossible they should be the medium of conveying to us a perfect and infallible standard.—Our opponents seem to talk variously on this subject. When it is their object to show that their own views of the Bible are sufficient and safe, then language is a very intelligible medium. “We are constantly reading books without any of this distrust—and books, too, written by men in every sense fallible.” “Why are we not in constant and grievous uncertainty about the meaning of our familiar authors?” But when it is their object to depreciate inspiration, then “all human language, when referring to what is intellectual, to what is spiritual, is but an approximation to the truth.” And “how can the idea of absolute infallibility be attached to such an instrument of communication?” Admitting, however, all that can justly be said as to the uncertainty of human language, we are unable to see how this goes to disprove the reality or the necessity of divine inspiration. If words are not an infallible medium of communication, they are the best medium we have; and if God *was pleased* to give us an inspired record of his will, to what means of accomplishing his purpose should he have recourse, except to language? Besides, if language is essentially imperfect, it ought surely to be made as perfect as possible; and the consideration of its imperfection, so far from being a reason against inspiration, is an important reason in its favor,—one which should lead us to receive with thankfulness, and peruse with diligence, the divinely attested record which God hath given us.

But perhaps it will be denied by those on whom we here remark, that they do reject the inspiration of the Scriptures; and there are sentences in the article before us, which might seem to justify such a denial.—But if they do not deny the inspiration of the *Scriptures*—and by the *Scriptures* we mean the entire canon of our sacred writings—then, with whom are they contending? Their objections and arguments are all levelled against themselves, as really as against us.—The truth is, however, these men do deny the inspiration of the Scriptures; and the insinuations to the contrary

which occasionally appear are but new instances of self-contradiction, for which the writings of many among them have become so remarkable. It may be amusing to our readers to review and contrast some of their declarations on this subject.

After quoting a passage from Dr. Knapp, in which he speaks of the books of Scripture as "given by inspiration of God," and "written under a divine impulse," these reviewers say, "*We have no difficulty in admitting the doctrine of inspiration, in the general terms here laid down.*"

"We believe that the truths of our religion were inspired, and that the teachers of our religion were *divinely directed and assisted to communicate them.*"

"Those *writings*" ("the Old Testament as a whole") "*had a divine and supernatural origin. They had a higher origin than the will of man.*"

"If we took his arguments" (the arguments of Dr. Woods for a plenary inspiration) "just as they stand in their simple statement, we should never suspect that they were designed to establish a position different from that in which we ourselves stand."

After quoting Dr. Woods' arguments for the inspiration of the New Testament, one of which asserts, "that there are many passages in the New Testament to show, that the *writers considered themselves to be under the infallible guidance of the Spirit,*" the reviewers say, "*We can admit all these propositions, and we have no doubt, indeed, of their truth, without coming to the conclusion to which Dr. Woods would guide us.*"

The reader of the Scriptures "would rise from their perusal with an argument *stronger than we can express against the doctrine of verbal inspiration, or of special guidance in regard to the style of writing and modes of illustration.*"

"The style is natural, and therefore *is not supernatural.*"

"These writings," (the Scriptures) "so far as their composition is concerned, are to be regarded as possessing a properly and *PURELY human character.*"

"The manner, the style, the phraseology, the choice of words, the order of thought, the selection of figures, comparisons, arguments to enforce the communication, was *altogether a human work.*"

"They" (the Scriptures), "*are not, in the common sense inspired—they were not produced under the miraculous supervision of the Deity.*"

"We are desirous that those who are least versed in questions of theology may understand, that a *denial of the immediate inspiration of the Scriptures* does not, in the slightest degree, affect their authority."

"It would not follow that those holy men" (the writers of the Old Testament) "*were indebted for their style, or for any direction of their style, to inspiration.*"

It appears from the extracts here exhibited, that while the conductors of the Examiner "have no difficulty in admitting" that the books of Scripture were "given by inspiration of God," and "written under a divine impulse;" they deny "the immediate inspiration of the Scriptures," and assert that "they were not produced under the miraculous supervision of the Deity;"—and while they profess to hold, that the sacred "writings had a divine and supernatural origin," that the writers "were divinely directed and assisted to communicate them," and "considered themselves to be under the infallible guidance of the Spirit;" they also hold, that the Scriptures "are not, in the common sense, inspired," but "so far as their composition is concerned, are to be regarded as possessing a properly and *PURELY human character.*"*

* These are not the only instances of contradiction which occur in the article before us. The question we are told on one page "is indeed about words. It is about the ve-

It is evident, on the whole, that leading Unitarians in this region are intending to persist in rejecting the inspiration of the Bible, and in refusing to receive it as the word of God. The result to which they have come has not been adopted suddenly, or without opportunity for consideration. In some minds it has been matured, and the way has been preparing for a disclosure, for several years. The following views respecting the old Testament were expressed by Professor Norton, as early as A. D. 1818.

"While we believe that God gave the Jews the knowledge of himself, and taught them some of the great truths of religion by a miraculous revelation, and miraculously superintended their concerns; we at the same time believe that the records of their history were composed *by men*. We must, therefore, warn those whom we instruct, from attributing to God *the human passions, the imperfect views, the national prejudices, and the false moral judgements of actions and character which belong only to the historian*."—"We believe that God made to his ministers, under the Jewish dispensation, most sublime communications respecting his nature and works; but that *the language in which these truths were expressed by them was their own*." "We may further, I think, rationally teach, that *many of the particular laws of the founder of the Jewish State are attributed to Jehovah, only because Moses was appointed and commissioned by God as the lawgiver of that State*, and might, therefore, be considered as acting throughout under his authority."*

From this extract we gather, first, that in the judgement of Professor N. certain portions of the Old Testament, those particularly in which he thinks are exhibited "imperfect views, national prejudices and *false* moral judgements of actions and character," constitute no part of the revelation, but, both in thought and language, "belong only to the historian." Secondly, that in other portions, containing "sublime communications," from God, "respecting his nature and works," the *language* is to be attributed to the writer exclusively. And thirdly, that "*many of the laws*" which Moses gave to Israel, and which he declared he received from God, were the result of his own wisdom, while acting under a general commission from Jehovah.

It is urged by Dr. Woods, that unless the inspiration of our sacred books extends to the language as well as the thought, we may be disturbed by continual doubts as to the propriety of some of the representations of Scripture.

"Here, we might say, Paul was unfortunate in the choice of words; and here, his language does not express the ideas he must have intended to convey.

hicle of communication, about style, about the manner of writing." But on another page the writer carries the question much farther than this, and demands of *us* whether we "believe in the inspiration of *every idea* that is contained in the Bible." And after quoting a part of the second Epistle to Timothy, he asks, "Can any sensible man believe that *these ideas* were inspired? We presume not."

Again, he represents it as "the *great difficulty*" with us, that the Bible must be regarded as "a *perfect book*,"—necessarily implying that he does not thus regard it. But with all its imperfections, he speaks of it on the opposite page as "*just* what God saw to be suited to the ends of revelation," and believes "it was *best* that the communication should be left to be made *just as it was made*."

* Discourse on Religious Education, pp. 21—25.

Here, the style of John was inadvertent ; and here it was faulty ; and here it would have been more agreeable to the nature of the subject, and would have more accurately expressed the truth, had it been altered thus."

The reviewers in the Examiner admit the force of this objection, but insist that they "*seldom* find occasion" to use such language respecting the Bible ; implying that in *some* instances they "do find occasion" thus to criticise and censure our sacred books, and that when they think there is occasion, they have no objection to doing it.

Taking the whole subject in connexion, we come to the same conclusion respecting the views of leading Unitarians, to which we were brought in a former number, and which we must be allowed to repeat.

"No manner of inspiration, not even a general superintendence, attaches to the language of Scripture. It is the word of man, and not of God, and is to be regarded, entirely and throughout, as a *human composition*. And as to the *ideas* conveyed by this language, though some of them are inspired, others are not, and every one must judge for himself, (though he has no certain means of judging) how much to receive as a revelation from God, and how much to impute to the ignorance, the prejudice, the ingenuity, or the device of man."

Unitarians have not yet informed us definitely and fully what portions of the Bible they mean to set aside as forming no part of the revelations of God. They have, however, told us some things ; and it may be interesting, before we close, to trace the progress of developement on this subject, up to the present period. We learn, then, in the first place, that "*many* of the particular laws" which were given to Israel, came not, as the Scriptures assert, from God, but from Moses. We further learn from Dr. Ware, and the sentiment has been more than once expressed in the Examiner, that all "the arguments, illustrations, and topics of persuasion employed" by the sacred writers to enforce their instructions, "were the suggestions of their own minds." The Epistle to the Hebrews is formally discarded as uncanonical, and, in many parts, unreasonable. We must also reject all those portions which seem to us trivial or unimportant ; as 2 Tim. iv. 10—13. "Can any sensible man believe that these ideas were inspired ? We presume not." We must reject, too, those parts which appear to be founded on the writer's "private notions of fitness and propriety ;" for instance, 1 Cor. xi. 1—16. "No Christians," we are falsely told, "not even the most Orthodox, believe" these verses "to be . . . inspired." Those parts are also to be rejected, in which the writer seems to be "giving utterance to feelings entirely natural, in words and arguments purely human ;" for instance, 1 Cor. ix. 1—7. We are further to reject all "the imprecations" of the sacred writers, their "imperfect views," their "false moral judgements," their "mistakes in philosophy and discrepancies in statements of facts," all that is "local," all that is "temporary,"

in short, everything that seems to us unreasonable ; for it is said expressly,

“If we are asked how we distinguish between the private opinions of the writers, and the essential principles of their religion, between what is of partial and temporary, and what is of universal and constant obligation, we answer, that we do it, as we would do everything else of a similar nature, by the *sober exercise of our reason.*” Vol. viii. p. 139.

Our readers will learn from the statements here made what havoc is coming to be made of the Scriptures, and the importance of guarding them with a vigilant eye and a strong hand. We need say nothing to impress the importance of this discussion. ‘If the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?’ And if the inspiration of the Scriptures, their *plenary* inspiration, does not lie at the foundation of the Christian’s hope, we know not what subject or doctrine is entitled to such a distinction. The points at issue in this discussion may appear to some a small matter ; but only suffer these questions to be carried on the wrong side, and we hazard nothing in saying that the Bible, as to all essential purposes, is gone. Only yield to our opponents the full range of their principles, and there is not a sentence of the Bible, on which the advocate of revelation can lay his hand, and say, ‘*This is authoritative—this is the word of God.*’ For if he appeals to the Penteteuch, much that Moses pretended to have received from God was of his own invention. If he refers to the historical parts of the Old Testament, no small portion of these “belongs only to the historian.” If he quotes from the Psalms, many passages here are to be rejected. If he quotes from the alleged discourses of Christ, these were “reported by the Evangelists from memory, and not always with perfect accuracy.” If he quotes from the writings of the apostles, they in some instances were mistaken. Or let him quote from what part of the Bible he may, the *language* is “purely human,” and is as likely to be faulty as any other language. Suppose he quotes the introduction to John’s gospel, in proof of the Divinity of Christ ; but who can be sure that the old apostle did not Platonize, and conform his language, if not his theology, to the false philosophy of the times ? Or suppose he quotes the strong language of Paul, to prove the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ ; but Paul, it must be remembered, was a Jew, had been cradled and nurtured among victims and sacrifices, and we must be careful not to mistake his private opinions and Jewish notions for the revelations of Jehovah.

It will be perceived at once, that under the application of principles such as these, the Bible is of no value, as a common and authoritative standard of appeal. For what can be proved by it ? And why should any be at the trouble of quoting and interpreting proof-texts, if, after the meaning is ascertained, there is still another

question to be decided at the bar of reason, viz : *Is this meaning true or false ?*

We commend this subject to the consideration of Christians of all denominations who love the Bible, and call upon them to unite with us, in defending the full inspiration and the divine authority of the word of God. The authority of this sacred word is now assailed ; and what renders the assault more fearful, it is made (as it has been before) under a profession of regard, and a cover of friendship. Of the spread of open, scoffing infidelity our apprehensions are comparatively feeble. But when we see infidelity in the high places of the church, and hear it from lips which ought to be among the first to defend the unerring standard of the word of life, we cannot but lift a note of warning, and call upon all who love the Bible to unite in its defence.

We commend this subject to the consideration of sober, reflecting Unitarians—fathers, mothers, and heads of families. Are such persons aware of what is doing under their patronage, and with a reliance on their countenance and favor ? Are they prepared to give up the Bible, as a standard of appeal, and a rule of duty ? Are they willing that their children should be educated under the influence of principles in regard to the Bible, like those on which we have here remarked ? Are they sure that they shall not themselves need the Bible, the *whole* Bible, for their instruction and comfort, as they travel through this vale of tears ? And are they willing to turn away from that ‘ sure word of prophecy,’ that ‘ light shining in a dark place,’ by the beams of which the holy of other ages have walked to heaven ?

We would commend a further consideration of this solemn subject even to those Unitarians on whose writings we have felt it our duty to remark. It may be they are not fully aware of the nature and influence of those results to which they have come. We call upon them, therefore, to pause, and consider, and retrace their steps. Our consciences bear us witness that we have not pursued this discussion with feelings of bitterness or hatred. Had we written a line under the influence of such feelings, most gladly would we blot it out with tears. But we do feel the importance of the subject, and under a sense of its great importance, we feel impelled to expose impending dangers, and warn our fellow travellers to the judgement to beware. For whether received or rejected, *the Bible will stand*. Having “ God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, *without any mixture of error*, for its matter,” it has sustained and outlived a thousand assaults, and it cannot now be overthrown. But those can be overthrown who dare to trifle with it, and who refuse to receive it, and walk by it, as the standard of truth and duty, the word of the living God. Let impetuous mortals, then, beware ; and instead of exalting their own powers, and proudly leaning to their own understandings, let them in meekness receive the engrafted word, which is able to save their souls.

MISCELLANEOUS.

EDUCATION REPORTER AND BOSTON RECORDER.

THE subject of Education is one of paramount interest and importance, in relation to individuals and communities, to this life and the future. Of its advantages, when wisely directed, no one entertains a doubt, and the power which it is capable of exerting is immense. If it cannot literally create new faculties, it can transform, expand, and invigorate those with which the Creator has endowed us. If it cannot infuse the living soul, it can enlarge and elevate the soul, and bear it onward in its eternal course beyond any assignable limits. It is one of those subjects which commend themselves to all classes and descriptions of persons—to the aged and the young, to parent and child, to the friend of his country, of the church, and of the souls of men.

It should be regarded as among the favorable omens of the present age, that the subject of education, so great and interesting always, is now exciting unwonted attention. Not only is the old established system of school education continued, we hope with increased facilities and power, but the Infant school, the Sabbath school, the Bible class, the Lyceum—names and institutions formerly unknown—have come into notice, and multitudes of every age, from lisping childhood to those in the busy scenes of active and professional life, are drawn frequently together, to enjoy their benefits. A system of general, popular education has been adopted, the results of which, *if wisely and perseveringly pursued*, can be hardly estimated.

But here, we apprehend, is the danger: These frequent meetings for general instruction may be so conducted as to excite little interest, and then they will soon grow stale and be neglected; or they may fall under a corrupting influence, and then they will prove a curse, rather than a blessing. They need, therefore, to be fostered and encouraged, and to be furnished with a continual supply of new, interesting, and profitable topics for investigation and discussion. They need also to be looked after and watched over, not with the stern eye of a censor, but with that of an intelligent and faithful friend.

But how shall this important service be rendered?—It may be rendered in a variety of ways;—by the stately periodical, like the *Journal of Science*, or the *Journal of Education*;—or by means of *Scientific Tracts*;*—or perhaps more efficiently by a weekly paper, devoted to this specific object, and designed to circulate among the School committees, and teachers, and lecturers, and lyceums, and institutions for popular instruction, with which our busy land is coming to be filled. Such a paper is the *EDUCATION REPORTER*, a few numbers of which are before the public, and to which we feel a pleasure in directing the attention of our readers. In the principles and talents of the editor, (Rev. Mr. Rand,) his long experience in a kindred employment, his industry and perseverance, in the attention which he is known to have paid to the general subject of education, and in the character of the numbers already issued, the public have every assurance which the nature of such an experiment admits, that the paper will not disappoint its patrons, but will meet and answer the important

* A series of "Scientific Tracts," to be "conducted by Josiah Holbrook and others," has been commenced, which, if properly prepared, may be very useful.

object of its institution. We trust it will commend itself to the friends and promoters of education in this community generally, and that its circulation and consequent usefulness will be equal to its deserts.

By the removal of Mr. Rand to his new sphere of labor, our good old friend and ally, the Boston Recorder, has fallen into other editorial hands. Of this change we need only say at present, that it has been effected with the entire concurrence and approbation of such of the tried supporters of the Recorder as could be conveniently consulted, and that the results of it, thus far, are highly satisfactory. We trust they will not be less so in future, and that this—we had almost said *venerable* paper—for it is the eldest of the kind, we believe, in existence—which has carried light and comfort into so many families, may continue and extend its weekly visits, to instruct and edify the friends of truth, and convince and reclaim the gainsayer and wanderer.

As a specimen of what may be expected from the new editor (Mr. Stowe), and to furnish those of our readers who do not see the Recorder with the means of deciding a very important question, we present an extract from the number for July 14. The occasion of the article was as follows. Dr. Channing, and other Unitarians, have been urging into notice and circulation a new English Testament, conformed to the corrected copy of Griesbach. In our number for March last, we replied to their statements and appeals by saying, that "Dr. Knapp's Testament is now admitted by German scholars, Liberal as well as Orthodox, to be superior to Griesbach's." (p. 134.) This assertion was contradicted in the last number of the North American Review, and a further attempt made to urge Griesbach into notice. The article which follows is in reply to the North American; and is a complete vindication of the position we had taken.

GRIESBACH'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

Agreeably to our promise last week, we proceed to offer a few remarks on this celebrated work.

We cheerfully grant, in the outset, that the arduous and judicious labors of Griesbach deserve all praise; and that, with the exception perhaps of Wetstein, he is unquestionably superior, in point of talent and faithful diligence, to any who preceded him in the critical examination of the text of the New Testament. We further say, that no biblical scholar can ever mention the name of Griesbach without feelings of veneration for his character and attainments.

Having said this, we hope we shall not be accused of being under the influence of prejudice against him, if we prefer Knapp's Testament to his, provided we can give good reasons for our preference. That Griesbach, though a great critic, was far enough from perfection, may be seen by consulting Dr. Lawrence's Essay on the subject, published in England some years since, and republished in the Princeton Biblical Repertory. The first edition of his Greek Testament was published in two volumes in 1775—77, and the second in 1796—1806.

Something is attempted to be made of the circumstance that Griesbach was a Trinitarian, and that his emendations of the text are not always favorable to the doctrine of the Trinity. It is true that Griesbach was professedly a Trinitarian; and *so all the theologians in Germany of any repute, Liberal as well as Orthodox, so far*

as they profess to be Christians, profess to be Trinitarians. The doctrine of the Trinity is not the dividing line in that land of learning, for it is a conceded point that the Bible teaches this doctrine, and that it is a constituent part of Christianity; and the only question on which they are at issue is, *Was the Bible given by supernatural revelation?* Accordingly, the most common names of the two parties are, *Naturalists* and *Supernaturalists*. All the principal treatises on theology from both these parties, recognise, illustrate, and defend the doctrine of the Trinity, as a fundamental doctrine of the Bible and of the Lutheran church. If any one doubt the fact, let him examine the theological system of Schleiermacher, who is of the liberal party, and a *Naturalist* in his views of inspiration; and of Hahn, who is reckoned among the Orthodox, or *Supernaturalists*. The only difference between them is, that the latter considers himself bound to believe what the Bible teaches; and the former does not consider himself thus bound.

Griesbach, therefore, though professedly a Trinitarian, might have been as *liberal* as any of his contemporaries; and surely he was never very *rigidly* Orthodox. Some of the rules which he prescribed to himself in the examination of various readings, show that in his anxiety to walk straight, he almost leaned over backwards. We will mention two.

6. "The reading that gives a sense especially calculated to *nourish piety*, (particularly monastic) is to be suspected."

8. "Among many readings of one passage, that which more than the others, manifestly favors the *doctrines of the Orthodox*, is justly regarded as suspicious." (Pref. p. 61.)

We make no objection to these rules, considering circumstances; we merely say, that *twelve* and *thirteen* are equi-distant from *twelve and a half*.

In 1782—88, Prof. Matthaei, formerly of Moscow, after a most laborious examination of more than a hundred MSS. (the greater part of which were unknown to Griesbach,) and a careful comparison of the text with the scriptural quotations in the writings of the Fathers, published a splendid edition of the Greek Testament in twelve volumes, with Latin translations, critical remarks, fac similes of MSS., &c. He strenuously opposes the principles of Griesbach throughout, and comes very near the received text. Eichhorn, who for more than 30 years stood at the head of the liberal party in Germany, speaks in the highest terms of the merits of Matthaei, and observes in reference to his opposition to Griesbach, that he had himself *always preferred a middle path between the two*. (Bibliothek, B. II. S. 311.) Hug expresses an equally favorable opinion of Matthaei, though he gives a more decided preference to Griesbach. (Einleit. in N. T. B. I. S. 842.) It ought to be mentioned to the honor of Griesbach, that in his second edition, he very carefully availed himself of all the remarks that had been made upon the first.

In 1827, Dr. David Schulz, a decided *Naturalist*, published at Berlin the first volume of a new edition of Griesbach's Testament, with numerous corrections and additions. In his Preface, among

many other reasons for revising the text of Griesbach, he gives the following :

1. Griesbach, and those who preceded him, in settling the text, relied too exclusively on *external* evidence, such as the authority of *codices*, versions, the Fathers, &c., without sufficient regard to the *internal* evidence, that is, the genius of each writer, the custom of language, the course of thought, the scope of the argument, &c.

2. Griesbach did not investigate with sufficient accuracy the origin and sources of various readings, nor form on this ground a just estimate of these variations.

3. The most ancient and best *codices*, the versions, and Fathers, had not been described, collated, and estimated with due correctness, by Griesbach and his predecessors.

4. The doctrine of Griesbach concerning the *recensions* of the New Testament, though not to be rejected entirely, yet ought to be restricted within narrower limits, and applied more cautiously and sparingly, than has been done by Griesbach and his disciples.

Dr. Schulz gives several other reasons of the same nature ; but these, which are the first that occur, may suffice as a specimen. (Pref. p. 30.)

In 1797, Dr. Knapp of Halle published his Testament, which approaches much nearer the common reading than Griesbach. The merits of this work are very cheerfully acknowledged by Griesbach himself, in the Preface to the second volume of the second edition of his Testament ; and he candidly avows that its excellencies enabled him to make several improvements in his own work. Eichhorn also gives a hearty recommendation of Knapp. (Bibliothek, B. IX. S. 574.) Dr. Schulz, in the Preface already referred to, gives the same testimony, and affirms that Griesbach owes it to Knapp, that the second edition of his Testament is so much more correct than the first. He then adds : " Knapp alone certainly has deserved the best of all in modern times in this department of New Testament criticism ; and among theologians you will scarcely find his equal for acuteness and perspicacity, or cautious skill and learning, or a subtle knowledge of the classic languages." (Pref. p. 9.) This from Dr. Schulz, respecting so Orthodox a character as Dr. Knapp, is surely very high praise. This Testament has gone through four very large editions, each with improvements, the last by Dr. Thilo in 1829.

Such being the facts, we are surprised to find in the North American Review, in addition to the most unqualified eulogy of Griesbach, such language as the following, in reference to the labors of Knapp. " What state it was of opinion, or of the book market in Germany, which called for such a work, we cannot presume to say."—" It was bought at first because there was nothing to compete with it, and copies were subsequently multiplied, because, from use, they would sell."

We readily allow that the merit of original and laborious collation belongs to Griesbach, and that had it not been for the materials which he collected and labored upon, the work of Knapp would not

have existed ; that Griesbach is the leader and Knapp the follower : still we affirm, that as Griesbach had all the ardor and adventurous boldness of a first discoverer, as he had an immense mass of materials to arrange and examine, as he was walking in an untrodden path, as it was impossible for him accurately to weigh and to contemplate in all their bearings all the principles on which he acted ; —Knapp, who came after him, and had all the advantage of his previous labors, who walked in a path that was already cleared, and made use of materials that were already collected, and acted on principles that had been sufficiently tested, and proceeded with so much caution and skill and conscientiousness, is a much safer guide, has given us a more faultless text, than Griesbach ; and in this opinion we think we are supported by the reason of the thing and the judgement of the German public. The question is not, Who performed the most labor ? Who led the way ? Who has the most merit ?—but the simple inquiry is, Who has come to the most accurate result ?

We have several reasons for concluding that the attempt to crowd Griesbach on to the religious public, at the present time, is premature. (We speak here of the public at large ; professed scholars ought to have a critical Testament.)

1. Facts are now so rapidly accumulating, in regard to the text of the New Testament, by the researches of travellers and scholars, that we are not yet authorized to present a new *standard text*.

2. Most of the investigations, which have been made since Griesbach's time, have tended to bring the text nearer than he left it, to the *received text*.

3. With two or three exceptions, the alterations, which Griesbach proposes, are so very slight, that we need be in no haste about a change.

4. It is best not to attempt so important an innovation until we are quite sure that it is necessary.

TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS TO THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Extracted from Wilson's Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity.

“WHAT, then, do the Fathers declare as to the opinion of the church, in the first centuries, on the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures ?

1. First, as the sacred writers of the New Testament cited passages from the Old Testament with the solemn title of *SCRIPTURE*, without any addition, as expressive of the inspiration of the books of the Jewish canon ; so the Christian Fathers, coeval with the apostles, constantly quote the writings of the New Testament under the same name.

2. Again, the other titles which they familiarly attribute to the New Testament, almost all imply their divine inspiration. They call them, "The Word of God, The Voice of God, The Oracles of Heaven, The Oracles of the Holy Ghost," and especially they apply to them the expression which we have already noticed, as containing the sum of the whole argument, *γραφή θεϊνευστος* divinely inspired scripture.

3. Further, the distinction which the ancient Fathers made between canonical and apocryphal books, turned on this very point of inspiration. They accounted other writings, however true upon the whole and edifying, not canonical, because not inspired by the Holy Ghost.

4. Then, as to the innumerable passages in which they speak their own sentiments, and that of the church, on the subject,

Hear, first, Clemens Romanus, Bishop of Rome, (A. D. 91—110,) a contemporary with the apostles, to whom we have frequently referred already. "The apostles," says he, "preached the gospel, being filled with the Holy Ghost—the Scriptures are the true words of the Spirit—Paul wrote to the Corinthians things true by the aid of the Spirit—he, being divinely inspired, admonished them, by an epistle, concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos."

Justin Martyr (A. D. 89—164) says, that "the gospels were written by men full of the Holy Ghost."

Irenæus (A. D. 97—202) declares that "all the apostles received the gospel by divine revelation—that the scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God—and that therefore it is wickedness to contradict them, and sacrilege to make any alteration in them."

Theophilus, (A. D. 168—181,) citing the authors of the Old and New Testament, says, "that both the one and the other spake, being inspired by one and the same Spirit."

"These things," he also observes, "the Holy Scriptures teach us, and all who were moved by the Holy Spirit."

Clemens Alexandrinus (A. D. 191) says, "that the whole Scriptures are the law of God, and that they are all divine, and that the evangelists and apostles wrote by the same Spirit that inspired the apostles."

Tertullian, (A. D. 150—220,) in several passages, attributes the Scriptures to the Spirit, and once expressly says, that "the majesty of the Holy Ghost suggested what St. Paul wrote."

Origen (A. D. 230) teaches, that "the Scriptures proceeded from the Holy Spirit, that there is not one tittle in them, but what expresses a divine wisdom, that there is nothing in the law, or the prophets, or the gospels, or the epistles, which did not proceed from the fulness of the Spirit, that we ought, with all the faithful, to say, that the Scriptures are divinely inspired; that the gospels are admitted as divine in all the churches of God, and that the Scriptures are no other than the organs of God."

The Emperor Constantine wrote unto the Council of Nice, (A. D. 323,) and called the Scriptures, "the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in writing."

An ancient writer in Eusebius, (A. D. 315,) says, "that they

who corrupt the sacred Scriptures, either do not believe that the Holy Spirit uttered the divine Scriptures, and then they are infidels; or think themselves wiser than the Spirit, and so seem to be possessed."

Can it be necessary to pursue our quotations further? Can any thing be more clear than the inference from such testimony? In short, to admit the full divine inspiration of the New Testament was, in the early church, the test of Christianity."

MORE EVIDENCE OF CONCEALMENT.

Extracted from a "Memoir of Rev. S. C. Thatcher," by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood.

OF the Sermon by Mr. Thatcher, at the Dedication of the New South Church, entitled, "An Apology for Rational and Evangelical Christianity,"* Mr. Greenwood observes, "It (the Sermon) became a general topic of conversation; and while by one portion of readers it was praised, as an able and lucid exposition of liberal and intelligible Christianity, and a calm and manly defence of those who had embraced such a faith, it was denounced by another portion, as advancing principles subversive of what they called the peculiar and fundamental doctrines of the gospel. The weak were alarmed at they knew not what; the bigotted were surprised at the avowal of nonconformity; the cautious shook their heads and intimated their doubts; while they who had observed the signs of the times, and who knew what they believed, rejoiced that the time had arrived, when *religious opinions could be fairly and openly discussed, when reason was to be permitted to come out into the light, and men could maintain that their minds were their own.*"

After finding some fault with the discourse, as speaking "too much in the tone of apology and confession," Mr. Greenwood proceeds, "If these peculiarities of opinion" (the peculiarities of Unitarianism) "existed, they ought to have been known. It was best for all sides that they should be known, and that an end should be put to a state of things which was an *improper*, a disagreeable, and from its nature a temporary one. The time may be easily remembered when, in our religious world, *there was nothing but distrust on the one side, and fear and evasion on the other*; when the self-conceited theologian looked awry on the suspected heretic, and the *object of his suspicion answered him with circumlocution and hesitation.* THERE IS NO DENYING THAT THIS WAS THE FACT. And how much better is it that there has been a change, and that we can now use language, as it was meant to be used, for the expression of ideas! And again it may be asked, How is truth ever to be known, if her face is al-

* This Sermon was delivered near the commencement of the year 1815, a short time previous to the publication of the pamphlet entitled "American Unitarianism."

ways to be *kept under a veil*? How are we to expect that our opinions are to be received or respected, if *they are studiously thrust aside, and into the shade, as if we were ashamed of them*? pp. 34—36.

RECENT PUBLIC ATIONS.

1. *A Letter to Wm. E. Channing, D. D.*, on the subject of Religious Liberty. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830. pp. 52.

We purposely defer an extended notice of this publication—one of the *most important* which has recently appeared, and for which the author is entitled to our warmest thanks—until the individual to whom it is addressed shall have had sufficient opportunity to reply. The following extracts will give our readers some idea of the object and spirit of the work—a work which, we cannot doubt, will have a rapid and extensive circulation.

"You (Dr. Channing) have given your name to the world as the author of accusations, that *we are aiming to subvert and destroy the religious liberty of this Commonwealth; that we are combined to put down all free inquiry in matters of religion; that we are endeavoring, in secret and openly, to introduce an ecclesiastical tyranny worse than that of the Inquisition; that we are determined to raise up ecclesiastical Courts to try, condemn, and punish all whom we deem to be heretics; and thus to prevent all right of private judgement, and all freedom in respect to religious opinion.*" "I do know that the accusations which you stand pledged to support are NOT TRUE. I aver that THEY ARE NOT, before heaven and earth. That they are accusations of a hurtful tendency, need not be said. They go to destroy all respect for us, all confidence in us, all prospects of our usefulness in society or in the church, just so far as you are believed; and to render us the objects of suspicion, of scorn, and of hatred. As injured men, as injured in a manner that is highly unjust and cruel, we call on you either for reparation, or else to support your charges." "On every ground of equity, you must either support the charges which you have made, *as to facts*; or take them back; or else stand before the public as one who has abused and maltreated his fellow beings."

"Sir, we have borne these charges in silence long enough—so long that not a few of your friends begin to aver, that silence gives consent to the truth of them." "There are boundaries beyond which it is not the duty of the peaceful and the inoffensive to go, in tolerating abuse of this nature without demanding a reparation. We have come to those bounds. We allege before the world that we have been slandered and abused by your writings; we appeal to the particulars; we offer the evidence; and we now appeal to every honest and candid man of any party, to judge whether we have not supported our charge, that you have made and often repeated such accusations against us." "My belief is, that you cannot make your charges good, against any man in this State who bears the name of Orthodox." "I have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance somewhat extensive, among the men who are active in promoting the interests of Orthodoxy in Massachusetts. I know that you have wronged them, and that you are utterly unable to support these charges."

"The Orthodox are not insensible to what their fellow beings think and say of them. Far from this." "They know when they are maltreated. They know when their rights are denied under cover of law; when they are excluded from

the literary and civil privileges and offices of the State ; when they are jeered at in private circles, and pointed at with the finger of scorn in public. With all this they have borne, and borne long ; I do not say that they have always done this with such patience and meekness as became them. I am afraid that this is not the case. But depend on it, Sir, there is a secret flame kindled in this Commonwealth, by such measures as I have named above on your part and that of your friends, which, though smothered long, cannot always be smothered. Justice, and fairness, and equality of rights, must at last become the order of the day. Well will it be for the peace of this community, if the season when this shall take place should not be long protracted. There is always danger in a smothered sense of injustice and oppression ; above all when this is the fact with respect to great numbers who belong to the leading class of men in the community ; danger to those who feel it, as well as to others. May Heaven avert its consequences from our beloved Commonwealth !"

2. *The History of the Old South Church in Boston ; in four Sermons*, delivered May 9, and 16, 1830, being the first and second Sabbaths after the completion of a century from the first occupancy of the present Meeting House. By Benjamin B. Wisner, Pastor of the Church. Boston : Crocker & Brewster. pp. 122.

A Review of these elaborate Discourses, and the Notes, which occupy nearly half the publication, may be expected in a future number.

3. *The Works of that eminent Servant of Christ, John Bunyan*, Minister of the Gospel, and formerly Pastor of a Congregation at Bedford. In three Volumes. New Haven : Nathan Whiting. 1830.

4. *The Christian, contemplated in a Course of Lectures*, delivered in Argyle Chapel, Bath. By William Jay. Second American Edition. Boston : Lincoln & Edmands. 1830. pp. 432.

In these Lectures the Christian is exhibited—"in Christ"—"in the Closet"—"in the Family"—"in the Church"—"in the World"—"in Prosperity"—"in Adversity"—"in his Spiritual Sorrows"—"in his Spiritual Joys"—"in Death"—"in the Grave"—"in Heaven." This work is in the usual animated and almost inimitable style of Mr. Jay, and it is sufficient evidence of the estimation in which it is held, that it has already passed to a second American Edition.

5. *A Discourse on Preaching the Word*, delivered in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. and published at the request of the Students. By Edward W. Hooker. Andover : Mark Newman. 1830. pp. 40.

"The object of this Discourse is to urge the importance of preaching THE WORD,—in distinction from preaching philosophy, "giving heed to fables," "turning aside into vain jangling," "doting about questions and strifes of words," and engaging in foolish and unprofitable speculations. The Sermon contains many seasonable and excellent remarks.

6. *Three Sermons, on the Obligations, Duties, and Blessings of the Sabbath* ; to which are added, Remarks on the Report made to the House of Representatives of the United States, March, 1830, on Sabbath Mails. By Charles Jenkins, Pastor of the Third Congregational Church, Portland, Me. Portland : Shirley, Hyde & Co. 1830. pp. 116.

The author of these Discourses, first, assigns reasons "why the friends of the Sabbath believe it to be an institution of universal and permanent obligation;" secondly, "considers some of the appropriate duties of the Sabbath;" and thirdly, points out "some of the personal blessings to be derived from the performance of these various duties." We are glad to see so satisfactory a discussion of this important subject, at the present time.

7. *The Kingdom of Christ*; a Sermon preached before the Annual Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, in Boston, May 29, 1830. By Heman Humphrey, D. D., President of Amherst College. Boston: Peirce & Williams. pp. 36.

"The kingdom of Christ," says Dr. H. "is his 'church, which he hath purchased with his own blood,' and which in its holiest aspirations asks for none but spiritual munitions for its defence. It wants no Jeffries, no Star Chamber, to enforce its discipline—no compulsory tithes to support its teachers—no military to extend its conquests or guard its sacred towers. Its preservation and increase do not depend upon bulwarks of stone and mortar, nor upon long training in the use of steel and gunpowder." "The church has always flourished most, when it has been let alone. And even a dark and frowning sky has been safer for it, than the brightest radiance of any political firmament. How wonderfully has it been purified and enlarged by the fires of persecution! How often have the faithful come up invigorated out of great tribulation; while, on the other hand, they have been all but destroyed by the caresses of kings and parliaments."

8. *Lessons for Infant Sabbath Schools*, with a Plan for conducting an Infant Class. Worcester: Dorr & Howland. 1830. pp. 108.

9. *Elements of Dogmatic History*. By William Muenschper, S. T. D. and Ordinary Professor of Theology at Marburg. Translated from the second edition of the original German. By James Murdock, D. D. New Haven: A. H. Maltby. 1830. pp. 203.

This work "is an outline of a *general history* of the Christian faith, with copious references to authorities and authors who have treated on the subjects." "It is purely a *history*: For the author did not design to discriminate between true and false doctrines," but "to narrate truly and candidly what doctrines were discussed, and how they were stated, defended, and attacked, and by whom, without laboring to prepossess the reader either for or against any doctrine."

10. *History of the Town of Natick, Mass.*, from the days of the Apostolic Elliot, MDCL., to the present time, MDCCCXXX. By Wm. Biglow. Boston: Marsh, Capen & Lyon. pp. 88.

From this amusing pamphlet, we extract a single paragraph, to show the *concealment* formerly practised by the Unitarian Clergy of Massachusetts. Speaking of Mr. Badger, a former Minister of Natick, who died in 1803, Mr. Biglow (himself a Unitarian) says,

"Like many of his distinguished contemporaries in the ministry. . . . he (Mr. Badger) was a Unitarian; but, LIKE THE REST, with the exception of Dr. Mayhew of Boston and Dr. Howard, his successor, he thought that, though it was lawful for them to avow this sentiment, IT WAS NOT EXPEDIENT. They believed that, *in omitting to mention this opinion*, they kept back nothing that would be profitable to their hearers." p. 61.

The peculiarities of Unitarianism must be of *very little importance*, in the estimation of their own receivers, if they can be concealed from a people, year after year, and still nothing be kept back that is profitable.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1830.

NO. 9.

COMMUNICATIONS.

WHAT CONSTITUTES INFIDELITY?

To the Conductors of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

GENTLEMEN,

AN article with the above title, which appeared in your pages several months since, appears to have excited unusual attention, and to have occasioned, in some minds, not a little disquietude. With the review in your last, in reply to the Christian Examiner, I have no reason to be dissatisfied, and shall not think it necessary to call further attention to what has of late been published in that work. On an article in the Unitarian Advocate for May last, I propose to offer a few remarks; in doing which, I shall of necessity be led into a more particular investigation of the general subject.

The conductors of the Advocate commence with saying,

“We are utterly at a loss to conceive how there can be any difference of opinion on the question, what profession of faith is necessary to constitute a man a Christian, as distinguished from an infidel; and we believe that until a comparatively recent date there has been but one opinion on the subject. The test now adopted by Christians of the exclusive sect, is altogether arbitrary and fallacious, and to us appears opposed to reason, to the usage of all Christian antiquity, and to the plain import of the language of the Bible.” “If we carefully read the New Testament, we shall find that the faith deemed necessary to constitute a Christian, by Jesus, and his apostles, was exceedingly simple. It consisted in the belief of this single proposition—*Jesus is the Messiah, or Christ*. Whoever made this profession was considered a Christian as distinguished from a Jew, or a Heathen; and whoever now makes it is a Christian, so far as faith is concerned. He is a Christian, as distinguished from an unbeliever or infidel, and he is authorized to complain of injustice done him, if his title to the name of Christian be denied him.”

“This, we conceive, is the sense of the term Christian, as distinguished from infidel. Whoever employs it in any other sense, departs from primitive usage; he assigns to it a meaning which was unknown to Jesus and his apostles; sets up a test not sanctioned by their example.”

"That the simple proposition, Jesus is the Messiah, or Christ, the Son of God, expressions which, in the language of the Jews, were considered as synonymous, was, as we have asserted, the only article of belief required by the Founder of our religion and by his apostles, the first preachers of Christianity, in order to the enjoyment of the Christian name and privileges, is too obvious to need formal proof."

In view of the extracts here given, two questions arise ; first, Was "the simple proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah or Christ*, the only article of belief required by the apostles in order to the enjoyment of Christian privileges ?" And, secondly, Does a profession of belief in this "simple proposition" constitute the proper distinction now between a Christian and an infidel ?

The first of these inquiries, although not directly connected with the subject in hand, is yet of sufficient importance to attract a moment's attention ; for it is one on which Unitarians have dwelt long and often, with great apparent satisfaction,* and which they seem to suppose must be decided in their favor. I shall presume, however, to decide it against them, and to maintain, that a bald, unexplained profession of belief in Jesus, as the promised Messiah, *was not sufficient*, in the days of the apostles, to entitle those who made it to the fellowship of Christians. In support of this position, I need only refer to several plain cases, in which those who professed to believe in Jesus as the Messiah were spoken of as enemies to the cross of Christ.

This evidently was the case with the *Judaizing teachers*, whom Paul denounced and anathematized as preaching another Gospel. These professed to believe that the Messiah had come, and that *Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah* ; but they denied the sufficiency of his atoning blood, and taught, 'Except ye be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, *ye cannot be saved.*' Acts xv. 1, 5. This sentiment was condemned by the assembled apostles in their consultation at Jerusalem, and those who held it were represented by Paul as '*perverting the Gospel of Christ,*' and making it of '*no effect.*'

Again, the Gnostic believers, whom John denounced, admitted that Christ had come, and that *Jesus was the Christ* ; but they denied that he had come *in the flesh*.† Considering *matter* as the *source of all evil*, they could not reconcile it with their notions of

* So long ago as 1810, Dr. Porter of Roxbury asserted, in his Convention Sermon, that the faith required of the primitive Christians "consisted of one glorious article, and was contained in one bright line, *Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ.*" This sentiment was echoed in a review of the sermon of Dr. P. in the Anthology in October of the same year. Mr. Hurlbut says, "The essentials of our creed may be stated in three words, "*Jesus is the Christ.*" Presumptive Arguments, &c. p. 32. "We thus arrive," says a writer in the Unitarian Advocate (vol. ii. p. 31.) "at the only true faith of the Gospel. It consists in believing this one plain proposition, *Jesus is the Christ.*" "What," says Mr. Whitman, "is faith in Jesus ? It is believing this one plain, simple proposition, *Jesus is the Christ.*" Sermon on Regeneration, p. 43.

† "There was a class of people who, at the same time that they acknowledged the truth of Christ's mission, held that he did not come *in the flesh.*" Hamilton's Reasons for the Unitarian Belief, p. 67.

the purity of Jesus to believe that he had a *material* body. They regarded him as the *spiritual image* of a man, who suffered, died, and rose again rather in *appearance* than in reality. This class of teachers, according to the standard instituted by Unitarians, must have been admitted without question or explanation to the fellowship of the Christian church. But not so judged the beloved disciple. 'Many deceivers,' says he, 'are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*. This is a deceiver and an ANTICHRIST." 2 John, 7.

Other instances equally in point may be adduced. Thus Diotrophes, who 'prated against the apostles with malicious words,' and whose evil deeds John promised he would remember, professed to believe that *Jesus was the Christ*. How should he have been in a situation to tyrannize over the church, without such a profession ? 3 John, 9, 10. "The Nicolaitans" also, and "that woman Jezebel," and those "that held the doctrine of Balaam," no doubt pretended to believe that *Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ*. How should they be suffered to teach in the churches of Asia, or to hold any manner of connexion with them, unless they believed as much as this ? Rev. ii. 14—20. There might have been those in these churches who held to the modern Unitarian notion, that if a candidate for membership professed to believe in *Jesus as the Christ*, no further questions must be asked ; and it was through their means, perhaps, that "the Nicolaitans" and "that woman Jezebel" gained admittance. But what says the ascended Saviour ? "The doctrine of the Nicolaitans—I HATE ;" and "I will cast that woman Jezebel into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, and *I will kill her children with death* .""*

When the apostles commenced their labors on the day of Pentecost, and for a while afterwards, the profession of a belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah implied, and was understood to imply, perhaps all that was requisite in doctrine and character,—so that there was scarcely a necessity of asking many questions. But before the labors of these holy men ceased, the mystery of iniquity began to work, errors were broached, and it became indispensable to be more explicit. Paul would wish to know of those who applied to him for admission to the churches, not only whether they believed that Jesus was the Christ, but whether they regarded the sacrifice of Christ as the sole and sufficient foundation of hope. He would wish to know whether they thought that they must "be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, *in order to be saved*." And John would be sure to inquire of those who applied to him for admission, not only whether they believed that the Messiah had come, but whether he had *come in the flesh*. He might wish to know, too, how they regarded the doctrine of "the Nicolaitans," and the teachings of "that woman Jezebel," and the heresy of

* If it be supposed that a *class of teachers* is here referred to, under the name and figure of an adulterous woman, the inference in my favor will be the stronger.

the Unitarian Cerinthus.* As errors and grounds of deception were invented and multiplied, a greater number of questions, and a more particular examination, would be necessary ;—and it is on account of the various errors and grounds of deception which now prevail, that an examination of candidates for membership has become indispensable to the safety of the church.

I proceed to inquire, in the second place, whether a profession of belief in Jesus as the Christ constitutes, at this day, the proper mark of distinction between a Christian and an infidel.—In discussing this question, I might pursue a similar course to that in my former communication. I might show, from the authentic and acknowledged writings of the old English deists, that most of them professed to believe that Jesus was the Christ. Morgan, “in many passages, speaks very honorably of *Jesus Christ*, and of the religion he introduced.” Chubb, in his posthumous works, acknowledges repeatedly the *divine mission of Christ*.” He says that by Christianity, he means “that revelation of God’s will which *Christ was, in a special manner, sent to acquaint the world with.*” Bolingbroke speaks of Christ as “the *divine Logos*,” by whom “the Christian system of faith and practice was revealed.” Woolston “declares, that he is the farthest of any man from being engaged in the cause of infidels or deists ; and that he writes, not for the service of infidelity, which has no place in his heart, but for the *honor of the holy Jesus*, and in *defence of Christianity.*” He concludes several of his discourses by declaring, that “his design is the advancement of the truth, and **THE MESSIAHSHIP OF THE HOLY JESUS, to whom be glory forever, Amen.**”†

It is needless, however, to go over with the subject, on this ground, again. The statements made in my former communication have not been refuted, nor can they be. And they are all in palpable contradiction to the line of distinction between the Christian and the infidel, attempted to be drawn in the article under consideration.

In determining the question now before us, there is another medium of proof to which I may recur, and which, it may be hoped, will be more satisfactory. The conductors of the Unitarian periodicals, who are so greatly scandalized at being denominated infidels, it is to be presumed, would not themselves prefer the charge of infidelity but upon the *most substantial grounds*. They, who complain so loudly of injustice done to them, would not *lightly* be guilty of the same injustice to others. Let it be known, then, and remembered, that that these men *have repeatedly charged the Liberal theologians of Germany with DEISM or INFIDELITY.*

In the Letters of Professor Stuart to Dr. Channing, published

* See Milner’s Ecc. Hist. vol. i. pp. 121—124.

† See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. pp. 4—6.

in 1819, a number of German writers are quoted for the purpose of showing the manner in which they regard and treat the Holy Scriptures. In a review of these Letters in the *Christian Disciple*, the author is represented as expressing an "apprehension" or "hope" "of the progress of *infidelity* in this country, especially among our clergy, and in that form particularly which *it* (infidelity) *has assumed in Germany*." Again ; "It is to the rejection of these doctrines, that Professor Stuart attributes the *infidelity* which exists in Germany."* It follows from these passages that, in the judgement of the conductors of the *Christian Disciple*, the Germans referred to by Professor Stuart are fairly chargeable with infidelity. In other words, they are *infidels*.

The *Christian Register*, referring to the Liberalists of Germany, in distinction from the Orthodox, says, "The German party, rejecting the miracles and inspiration of Jesus Christ, are in fact *DEISTS*."†—The *Unitarian Advocate* is still more full and direct in its charges :

"A part of the plan of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* is to confound American Unitarians with GERMAN DEISTS. This is an act of injustice too gross to be overlooked. We were shocked at the coolness with which it is perpetrated. When German theology began to be more generally known in this country, some remarks were made by the Rev. Professor Stuart in his letters to Dr. Channing, very highly in praise of the learning and talent of some of the wildest theorists on the continent. These men had written *deistical works*, and Dr. Stuart had read them. His praise of their learning would naturally detract something from his rebuke of their audacious *attacks on Christianity*. The gentleman who reviewed his letters in the *Christian Disciple*, spoke disparagingly of these learned Germans ; took off the whole of the compliment paid them at Andover ; and utterly disclaimed their theology. Besides this, we believe the *deistical works* imported for the Seminary at Andover from Germany, far outnumber all which could be found in Cambridge. If any leaning to the foreign theology may fairly be imputed in the one case it may be also in the other. But in good truth, there is in this country no such thing as a theology like that of Wegscheider, and others abroad."

We have it then, on the most unquestionable authority, that the Germans quoted by Professor Stuart, and Dr. Wegscheider, not quoted by him, are *deists* or *infidels*. A standard of infidelity is thus discovered, in which all parties in this country will be agreed, to which all may appeal, and by which (it may be hoped) several important questions may be determined. Does not Dr. Wegscheider profess to believe that *Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ* ? Yes, as pertinaciously as the conductors of the *Unitarian Advocate* themselves. Yet, in the judgement of these gentlemen, Wegscheider is an *infidel*. And in the judgement of the same gentlemen, no man ought to be called an infidel, who professes to believe that *Jesus is the Christ*.

We must leave them to reconcile the difficulty here presented in the best manner they are able. Meanwhile, as the line of distinction between the Christian and the infidel, which they have drawn

* Vol. i. N. S. pp, 330, 331.

† Number for June 27, 1829.

in the article before us, is manifestly wrong, and is inconsistent with their own declarations, it will be necessary to search for a more accurate distinction. And as we have now, in the *acknowledged* infidelity of Wegscheider and the other Germans referred to, a common standard of appeal, it may be proper to take up the question *de novo*, 'What constitutes infidelity?'

But who is Dr. Wegscheider? Who are the "German Deists" quoted by Stuart, to whom the appeal is now to be made?—Wegscheider is a professed Christian—a Lutheran clergyman—a Doctor of Divinity—a learned and distinguished professor of Christian Theology in the University of Halle;—a University containing, at this moment, more than eight hundred theological students. Bretschneider, an eminent clergyman at Gotha, places Wegscheider in the third class of German theologians,* "whom," says he, "we commonly denominate Rationalists. They agree in recognizing in Christianity, an institution at once *Divine*, beneficent, and intended for the salvation of mankind; in Jesus, a messenger of Providence; and they believe that in the Scriptures, *a true and eternal word of God is contained*, which is destined to be preserved and diffused by means of Scripture." They deny a miraculous agency in the communication of Scripture, and hold Christianity to be "a religion to which reason is capable of attaining. They therefore discriminate in Christianity the *essential* from the *non-essential*; the *local* and *temporal* from that which is of *perpetual validity*. To this class belonged, among philosophers, Steinbart, Kant, and Krug; and among theologians, W. A. Teller, Löffler, Thiess, Henke, and of living authors, J. E. C. Schmidt, DeWette, Paulus, *Wegscheider*, Röhr."—Again, Bretschneider says that Wegscheider "*avows the holy Scriptures to be the word of God* equally, whether it be mediately or immediately so, and therefore urges the duty of a firm adherence to their *Divine contents* in our religious instructions."†

But it will be more satisfactory to give the words of Wegscheider himself.

"It is," says he, "an unquestionable fact, that in the canonical books of the New Testament are contained the authoritative documents of the Christian religion, and of the Divine truth which it declares;‡ and that those documents are of the antiquity which they purport, and are *perfectly worthy of credit*."—"This being the case, it is our duty, in conducting a system of religious instruction for mankind at large, to employ the utmost attention and pains, that, laying aside those far-fetched conjectures and questions, equally difficult and unprofitable, which have been brought up in latter times, concerning revelation and the inspiration of the sacred books, we should evince that the Christian religion, as well as the Holy Scriptures, *originated in God as its Author*, and should urge upon men the *truly Divine contents of the Scriptures*, which be-

* These classes are formed, according to the views entertained by individuals respecting the Bible. Two classes are mentioned which have *lower* views of revelation than the Rationalists, and one which has higher.

† Reply to Rose, pp. 45, 46, and p. 10.

‡ The phraseology in which American Unitarians are accustomed to speak of the New Testament.

come constantly better understood, as what has *proceeded from God*, and is **THE TRUE WORD OF GOD.**"*

In regard to Wegscheider it may be further stated, that the charge of infidelity is resented by him and his friends *as highly* as it can be by any in this country. In January last, an article appeared in the Evangelical Church Journal, a Periodical published at Berlin, exposing the principles of Wegscheider, and the light and irreverent manner in which he was accustomed at times to treat the Bible. The consequence was a riot among the theologues at Halle, whose liberality and charity were excited to vengeance by the imputations cast upon their favorite Professor. They resolved themselves into a liberal mob, attacked the houses of the Orthodox bigots, and published on placards in different parts of the University, "*Wegscheider, who is IN ALL RESPECTS A CHRISTIAN.*"†

But enough has been said respecting the infidel Wegscheider. It is time that we inquire after those "German Deists," whose names were mentioned by Professor Stuart. The first of these is Semler, a Lutheran clergyman, a Doctor and Professor of Divinity at Halle, who spent his life in a critical study of the Bible, and in communicating the results of his investigations to others. He considered some "part of Scripture" as "inspired, or as *the word of God*," and was, says his biographer, Eichhorn, "the boldest and best read theologian among those who have deceased during the eighteenth century." "How painful it must have been to him," adds the same writer, "to hear his attacks upon theological speculations reproached as *attacks upon Christianity itself.*"‡

Other Germans mentioned by Professor Stuart are Ammon, and Thiess, and Heinrichs, and DeWette, and Eichhorn, and Paulus, and Henke, and Eckermann, and Herder, all distinguished biblical scholars, and several of them Professors of theology in the different German Universities.||

These are the infidels referred to in the Christian Disciple and Unitarian Advocate, and to whom I may now, (I hope without offence) *appeal*, in deciding the question, "What constitutes Infidel-

* Instit. Theol. Christ. Dogmat. Sect. 36, 44.

† See Boston Recorder for June 30.

‡ Life of Semler translated from Eichhorn in Norton's General Repository, Vols. i. & ii.

|| Ammon was Professor of Theology at Erlangen, and afterwards court preacher at Dresden. Bretschneider places him in his fourth class, among those "who call themselves Evangelical divines," and whose views of revelation are higher than those of the Rationalists.—Thiess was a preacher at St. Paul's Church, Hamburg, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Kiel. He died in 1810.—DeWette was a very distinguished Professor of theology at Berlin;—now at Bale. "What shall we say now of DeWette? That he is not a Christian? Surely he would look with *disdain* on any man who should think of such an accusation, and tax him with the highest degree of illiberality and superstition." Stuart's Letters to Channing, p. 168.—Eichhorn was an equally distinguished Professor and biblical scholar at Gottengen.—Paulus was a clergyman and Professor of theology at Wurtsburg, afterwards at Heidleburg. Henke was Professor of Divinity at Helmstadt.—Herder was an eminent clergyman and Ecclesiastical Superintendent at Saxe Weimar.—Thiess, Henke, DeWette, and Paulus, Bretschneider places in the same class with Wegscheider, and calls them Rationalists.

ity ?” And it will be seen at once that by appealing to these, several points, leading on to a full and definite decision, may be determined in a summary way. For if the Germans, of whom some account has been given, are infidels, Unitarians themselves being judges, then a man may be an infidel, and yet *not avowedly reject Christianity* ;—he may be an infidel, and profess to believe that *Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ* ;—he may be an infidel, and *pretend much respect for the character of the Saviour* ;—he may be an infidel, and admit that *some “part of the Scriptures is inspired,”* and that they “*contain the true and eternal word of God* ;”—he may be an infidel, and still be a *professor of the Christian religion*, an *observer of its ordinances*, and an *ordained minister of the sanctuary* ;—he may be an infidel, and at the same time be a *Doctor of Divinity*, and a *learned and lauded Professor of Christian theology* ;—he may be an infidel, and yet *spend his days and nights in a critical study of the Bible* ;—in a word, he may be an infidel, while he *scorns the name of an infidel*, and *resents the imputation of it*, as in the highest degree *injurious and scandalous*. If any still doubt whether these seemingly strange assertions can be supported, it will be kept in mind that the Germans, *by common consent*, are infidels ; and we have seen who these Germans are, and what are their stations, and what they profess to believe.

But if a man may be all that these Germans are—all that has been described, and yet be an infidel ; then what makes a man an infidel ? What is the proper distinction between infidelity and Christianity ?—And here we are brought, though by a different process, to precisely the same result as before. The *Christian* receives the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and *every portion* of them, as coming from God—as of binding authority—as the standard of his faith, and the rule of his conduct ; but the *infidel*, whatever he may profess or pretend—whatever may be his title or station, never in reality does this. He may think some *parts* of the Bible a divine revelation, but this is not true of it all. He may hold that it *contains* the word of God, but it is not itself the word of God. He may think the sacred writers honest, and, in the main, competent ; but then, as they had no special, divine assistance, they doubtless are chargeable with mistakes and errors, and must be judged of as to the accuracy of their statements and reasonings just like any other men. If any portion of their writings strikes us agreeably, as reasonable in itself and worthy of God, we are entitled to regard it as coming from God ; but whatever strikes us in a different manner, we may properly reject as no part of the revelation.

Views such as these respecting the Bible, I call *infidelity*. I know not what else to call them. They obviously go to take away the Bible, as an authoritative standard, and make reason, and

not Scripture, the rule of final judgement.* For in accordance with these views, what can be proved on the *simple authority* of the Bible ? Nothing. And what can be known, on the *simple ground* that the Bible declares it ? Nothing.—It is because I find views such as these in the writings of some of the Germans, that I am obliged to call them, with all their pretensions and all their reputation for critical learning, infidels. And it is because I find similar views in the writings of some American Unitarians, that I am constrained to apply the same term to them. With the reviewer in your last, I can sincerely say, I “call no man an infidel merely because his views differ from mine in regard to the person of the Saviour.” I call none infidels, but those who, in their cherished and uttered sentiments respecting the Bible, *are such*. I confidently believe that the great body of American Unitarians, or those who are commonly reputed such, have not yet rejected the inspiration of the Scriptures,† and adopted the opinions of those who would be thought their leaders in regard to the important subject before us. At least, I have no evidence that this is the case ; unless it be their willingness to patronize and countenance publications, like those on which I have been called to remark. But when we hear men charging the sacred writers with “imperfect views,” “inconclusive reasonings,” and “false moral judgements,” with “mistakes,” “errors,” and contradictions, and with recording in place of divine revelation, the mere “suggestions of their own minds ;” what are we to think of such charges ? And by what name shall those be called who prefer them ? Shall they enjoy the name and reputation, the fellowship and confidence of Christians, while they are frittering away peicemeal the sacred charter of the Christian’s hope ? Or shall they be made to bear the name which, for a like reason, they give to others of as lofty pretensions as themselves—the name of *infidel* ? I have no wish to inflict injury, by applying a hard and reproachful name ; but I must insist on the right (especially where the public good is concerned) of calling things by their right names. These men count it a slander now to bear the suspicion of infidelity, just as, a few years since, they counted it a slander to be denominated Unitarians. But their Unitarianism came out, and was, at length, acknowledged, notwithstanding

* Revelation, says a distinguished American Unitarian, “is itself *subjected to the decision of reason*, and must abide the test.” “And as with the evidence on which it rests, so with the *doctrines it contains*. THESE TOO ARE SUBJECTED TO THE TEST OF REASON.” Hurlbut’s Presumptive Arguments, p. 28.

† Perhaps it will be denied that *any* American Unitarians have rejected the *inspiration of the Scriptures*. But what is the inspiration of the Scriptures ? “By the inspiration of the Scriptures,” says Professor Norton, “is meant, either that they (the *Scriptures*, the *sacred writings*) were miraculously suggested by God, or that they were written under his miraculous superintendence.” Locke and LeClerc, p. 125. A very good definition. And have not the conductors of the Christian Examiner and Register rejected the inspiration of the Scriptures, according to the sense here given to the words ? Their readers will be able to answer.

ing it was long concealed ; and their infidelity is now too plainly discovered to be mistaken or denied.*

In the article under consideration, the conductors of the Advocate use the following language :

" We regard one as our master, even Christ ; from him we would derive our faith. We view him as the true light, and we would seek illumination from him, conceiving that his doctrines have the sanction of divinity. This is our impiety, and the whole of it. For this our names are cast out as evil ; for this we are told that we deserve, and shall find, the hottest place in hell."

In reply, I would barely ask these gentlemen, Where are you told so ? And by whom ? Just refer us to the author and page. When you have done this, and we have read for ourselves, we will believe you. But until you do it, we hold you chargeable with gross and unpardonable misrepresentation.

Again, these gentlemen assert in regard to the Bible,

" They (Unitarians) believe its doctrines inspired, but not, as it is said, its language ; the matter, but not the style ; the thought, but not the turn of expression in which it is conveyed ; and therefore it is dogmatically asserted that they are to be classed with infidels."

Now, if it was true that the Unitarians here referred to merely denied the inspiration of the sacred *writings*, this would be no slight error, as it would go to destroy the infallible, binding authority of these writings, and, to some extent, their credibility.† But the individuals spoken of do more than this. In respect to many parts of the book of God, they do not believe " the matter " is inspired, any more than " the style ; " " the thought," any more than " the turn of expression in which it is conveyed." Speaking, for instance, of a passage in Timothy, the reviewers in the Christian Examiner ask, " Can any sensible man believe that *these ideas* were inspired ? We presume not."

The object of leading, learned Unitarians, in rejecting the inspiration of the Scriptures, and adopting the views which have been exhibited, is too obvious to be mistaken. They find the plain testimony of Scripture against them, and are satisfied that, on principles of fair, grammatical interpretation, it can never be made consistent with the Unitarian doctrine. Much has been done in years past to bring into doubt and suspicion certain portions of the

* The conductors of the Advocate speak of it as a *new* thing for men such as they to be charged with infidelity. But they ought to remember, that they have themselves been complaining of this charge, from their first number to the last. See vols. i. p. 3, and iii. p. 27. In 1822, the conductors of the Christian Disciple thought it necessary to publish an article to vindicate themselves against the charge of infidelity. See vol. iv. pp. 313—3. See also Chris. Exam. vol. v. p. 86.

† On the subject of inspiration, as extending to the *language* of our sacred books, I quote with much pleasure the following passage from Ernesti. " However we may be content to depend on human writers in human matters, yet in *divine ones*, containing *rules of faith and life* . . . we cannot be content to depend on mere human strength. For IT IS HARDER TO WRITE ACCURATELY THAN TO THINK RIGHTLY, a truth very conspicuous in the writings of philosophers, who so often fail to express their meaning with accuracy. We conclude, therefore, that in the *actual writing*, the apostles were assisted immediately by the Holy Spirit, the choice and order of matter pointed out, and the necessary accuracy and certainty given ; and that otherwise their writings could not properly be proposed as a *rule of faith and life*." See an art. in the Theol. Bibl. vol. iii. p. 469.

Bible, under a pretence of correcting the sacred text. Much, too, has been done by new translations, and by forced and far-fetched interpretations. But after all, there are, (as Mr. Dabney would say,) "*vexatious passages*," which cannot be disposed of by either of these methods. There are many things which do not well square with humanitarian theology; and the Orthodox doctrines of the divinity and atonement of Christ, of regeneration, justification by faith, and eternal punishment are too apparent. But what more can be done? The next resort is, to deny the inspiration of the sacred writings, and set them aside, as of infallible accuracy and binding authority. We will receive so much of them as seems to us reasonable, and reject the remainder.

The Liberalists of Europe, we *know*, have reasoned after this manner, whether those of this country have done so, or not. Wakefield "acknowledges that the hypothesis of the two natures in Christ agrees best with the *letter* of Scripture;" but insists "that here the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."* Wegscheider too admits that "in Scripture, literally understood, there are some grounds (*semina*) for the Orthodox doctrine as to the union of two natures in Christ."† Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, "confesses that the Orthodox interpretations are in *perfect conformity with the text*."‡ Another of the German Rationalists, in accounting for the conversion of a celebrated theologian from Neology to Orthodoxy, says, "It was very natural, as he (the convert) was *no friend of forced interpretations of the Scriptures*." Professor Gabler, also a Rationalist, has the following concession; "Whoever proceeds from the principle of an immediate divine revelation through Christ, and is still decidedly heterodox, *must either do the utmost violence to the clearest expressions of the New Testament, or be exceedingly inconsequent in all his reasoning*: for an impartial view of Biblical Theology, as a history of the doctrines of the New Testament, *must, in its nature, be PRETTY MUCH ORTHODOX*."||

But I hasten to bring this communication to a close. The great importance of the subject is my only apology for presuming to occupy so large a portion of your pages as I have already claimed. If there is any subject which the people of God in all ages have been agreed in regarding as fundamental, it is the inspiration and binding authority of the sacred Scriptures. Our Saviour and his apostles appealed to the writings of the Old Testament, as to a perfect standard. The primitive Christians appealed to the canonical writings of both Testaments in the same way. "Look into the Holy Scriptures," says Clement, "*which are the true words of the Holy Ghost*." Ye know that there is nothing unjust or counterfeit written in them." Sect. xlv. On the foundation of

* Hist. of Dissenters, Vol. iv. p. 253.

† Instit. Theol. Christ. Dogmat. Sect. 128. p. 383.

‡ See Biblical Repertory, Vol. ii. p. 495.

|| Journal for Theol. Literature (published by Gabler) for 1802, p. 594.

the Scriptures, as the "*true words of the Holy Ghost*," our feet rest upon a rock. We know where we stand, and feel that we have a firm support. But breaking away from these, and regarding them no longer as a perfect standard, we are afloat together on an ocean of speculation and conjecture, without anything on which to depend for guidance and safety.

Till the questions now at issue respecting the Bible are fairly settled, it is obviously of little importance to discuss any other questions, at least where an appeal to the divine word is necessary. For in the language of your reviewer, "Why should we be at the trouble of quoting and interpreting proof-texts, if, after the meaning is ascertained, there is still another question to be decided at the bar of reason, viz. *Is this meaning true, or false?*"

ORIGINAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE LATE GOV. SULLIVAN
AND DR. SAMUEL WEST, ON ISAIAH VII. 14,
AND MATT. I. 22, 23.

LETTER OF GOV. SULLIVAN.

Groton, 17th Nov. 1781.

DEAR AND REV. SIR,

Having an inexpressible pleasure in cultivating an acquaintance with you, and no opportunity offering to be where you are, I take the freedom of intruding this letter upon you, not doubting but that the goodness of your heart, and the deep literature of your mind, will furnish me with an answer sufficient to remove any doubts I may labor under. I should not expect a satisfactory solution of the following case from a divine who teaches the Christian religion, because it is the religion of his country or family; but from one who builds upon first principles, I may hope for light and information.—But to the point.

I have lately blundered upon a question in revealed religion. I find in the first chapter of Matthew, where the Evangelist is describing the advent of our Saviour, this text—"Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son," &c. The prophecy here referred to is in the seventh chapter of Isaiah, where, by the history of the transaction therein mentioned, two kings came up against Judah in the days of Ahaz, and about 750 years before Christ, and the prophet was directed to tell Ahaz to be quiet, and not to fear, for they should not prevail; and a sign was given, "A virgin shall conceive and

bear a son ; butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to choose the good and refuse the evil. *For* before the child shall know to choose the good and refuse the evil, the land which thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.”—The child here predicted was to be born in the days of Ahaz, and before the captivity of the ten tribes by the Assyrian monarch, as is agreed by Grotius, Hammond, Le Clerc, and others : And if this was not the case, how could the birth of the child be a sign of the truth of the prophecy ? And if it was, how can the Evangelist’s saying that the prophet spake of Jesus be reconciled with truth ? An anonymous writer says that the prophet, in the sixteenth verse, left speaking of the child predicted, and turned his attention to the Messiah. But the particle *for* appears to me an insuperable bar in the way of this hypothesis ; for in this light, instead of affording a reason in support of the prophecy, or serving to urge the truth of it, it will be but an unmeaning and useless part of the text. Le Clerc and some others solve the difficulty for themselves, in supposing that the Greek word rendered fulfilled, does not always mean the fulfilment of predictions of future events, but barely expresses an accommodation of borrowed words. If this is true, the prophet did not in this place prophesy of the Messiah at all ; and if the observation has force, it applies to many other quotations of the apostles, and will have a great tendency to weaken the evidence of revealed religion.

But some suppose that the prophecy is fulfilled in a secondary, typical, or allegorical sense, in Jesus ; and why may not the prophecies apply to everybody and everything else as well, in an allegorical and typical sense ? And if they have applied to two several persons already, why may we not expect a third ?

Whiston, aware of this difficulty, condemns all allegorical meaning, and wishes to restore the whole Hebrew Bible to its primitive purity, and avers that the Jews in the third century put a false copy into the hands of Origen to deceive the Christians. But this seems to be agreeing that the present copy does not amount to evidence sufficient to evince the truth of the Christian religion. And besides, how does Whiston know that there was a better copy 1700 years ago ? Surenhusius, the Hebrew professor at Amsterdam, talks learnedly of points used by the ancient Jewish doctors in reading and construing Hebrew, and gives many instances of license taken by the apostles in shifting Hebrew points and letters in their quotations. But why did not the apostles use the ancient points and letters ? or is it probable that they would make such shiftings as to turn the meaning of the text from one person to another ? Upon the whole, this learned conjecture serves only to resolve the difficulty into a multiplicity of errors.

I do not expect to have every part of revealed religion opened to my capacity, but sincerely wish to have it cleared of every palpable

contradiction. The Christian religion spreads so many moral beauties before my sight, that I am exceedingly unhappy when my mind labors in the evidence of it. And therefore from your learning and friendship, I hope to be taught, either that an inspired penman can, consistently with divine inspiration, be mistaken, or that there is no mistake in the quotation, by Matthew. If this point has been long settled, as perhaps you will tell me it has, you will forgive this intrusion, remembering that I only ask for the milk provided for babes.

I am, Sir, with most cordial friendship,
Your most Obed't. humble Serv't.

JAMES SULLIVAN.

Rev. Mr. West.

REPLY OF DR. WEST.

Dartmouth, Dec. 9, 1781.

DEAR SIR,

I received last night your favor of the 17th ult., which gave me inexpressible satisfaction, as it revived in my mind those happy days when I had the pleasure of your company and conversation; besides it was a convincing proof of your sincere and affectionate regards for me. Permit me, Sir, further to assure you, that I am extremely pleased with the subject of your letter, and I heartily wish that every gentleman of my acquaintance would discover as earnest a desire as you have done to attain a rational conviction of the truth of revealed religion. Were this the case, bigotry and infidelity would be no more. They would vanish away, like the shades of night before the rising sun.

Most cheerfully, then, will I now endeavour to solve the difficulties which you have proposed. I am fully convinced in my own mind that the passage in Isaiah vii. 14. is a real prediction of the miraculous conception of our Saviour; and that Matthew, in his first chapter, has applied this text in its true and literal sense, and not merely by way of accommodation. My reasons for it are these,—First, both the ancient Greek translations of the Seventy, (which I have by me) and the Chaldee paraphrase (as I find by Pool's Synopsis) translate the words as we do, viz. "*Behold a virgin shall conceive,*" &c.—Now as both these translations of the Seventy and the Chaldee paraphrase were made before the birth of our Saviour, and consequently before the sense of the text came to be controverted, they are a plain proof, that these ancient Jewish interpreters understood the text in the sense that Christians now do, viz. that a virgin should, in a supernatural way, conceive and bring forth a son. And we must naturally suppose that these ancient interpreters understood the true meaning of Hebrew words much better than we do at this day: therefore, they are unexceptionable

witnesses in favor of the Christian sense of this text. And, indeed, it is hardly possible to make a tolerable sense of it upon the modern Jewish interpretation, which is, "Behold a young woman shall conceive and bear a son." Now let us remember, that the occasion of these words was this—God had offered to grant Ahaz any sign he should desire, to remove his fears concerning the confederate kings. Upon his refusing to ask a sign, God says, 'Therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign;' and what is it? Why, according to the interpretation I am now considering, it is this, 'A young woman some time or other, no mortal can tell when, shall in the usual manner conceive and bear a son.' And what notable thing shall this son do? 'Why, he shall eat butter, and honey, as other children are wont to do, until he is grown big enough to know good from evil!' This interpretation is so low and flat, that if I thought it to be the meaning of the prophet, I should be tempted to call in question, not only his inspiration, but also his good sense.

Secondly, The Hebrew word which we translate *virgin*, seems to me incapable of being applied to any person, but a woman that had not known man; for the word properly signifies a hidden or concealed female, which evidently implies, as I understand it, one that had been hidden or concealed from the knowledge of man. The only places where this Hebrew word is used in Scripture are Gen. xxiv. 43. Exod. iv. 8. Ps. lxxviii. 25. Prov. xxx. 19. Cant. iii. 1. Chap. vi. 8. Isaiah vii. 14., which last is the text under consideration. I presume, Sir, if you examine these texts in the English translation, you will conclude they all speak of virgins. If, then, this Hebrew word is translated a *virgin* by the ancients, who lived before the birth of our Saviour, if it is everywhere so used in the Hebrew Bible, and if the etymology of the word requires us to understand it in this sense, we may most certainly conclude, that the text under consideration is a prophecy of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ.

But you will ask, How could the prediction of this future event be considered as a sign, that the Jews should not be destroyed by the confederate kings? I answer, the word which we translate sign, is used in Scripture, sometimes to signify the absolute and unconditional promises and threatenings of the Deity, in contradistinction to those promises and threatenings in which a condition is implied. A few words will make this point very plain and easy. In Jeremiah, eighteenth chapter, we are told, that when the Deity threatens to destroy a nation, if they repent of their evil deeds, he will not bring upon them the destruction with which he had threatened them; in like manner, when he promises to build up a people, if they become disobedient, he will not confer upon them the blessing which he had promised. Thus, we find Jonah declaring to the Ninevites, "Yet in forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed;" but upon their repentance we find the sentence was revoked.

Thus also God had promised to David, that his house and kingdom should be established before him forever ; but when David had been guilty of adultery and murder, he judged he had forfeited his right to the divine promise. See Ps. li. 4. "Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight, that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest ;" that is, having committed this heinous crime against God, he was ready to acknowledge, that God was just in promising that he would establish his house forever, and that he would be clear from injustice, though he should never perform his promise to him, but should judge him according to his deserts. Thus much concerning promises and threatenings that are conditional. There are others that are absolute and unconditional. These latter are called *signs*. In proof of this, we may observe, that when God told Moses, that he was about to send him to Pharaoh, to deliver the children of Israel from their bondage, Moses immediately feels his own imperfection, and inability to undertake such an arduous task, and says, "Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?" To this the Deity replies, "Certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be a *token* unto thee, that I have sent thee, when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain." The Hebrew word translated *token* is the same with that which we render by the English word *sign*, in Isaiah vii. 14. Here we see that the Israelites' worshipping God upon mount Horeb, is made a *sign*, that God had sent Moses to deliver them from the Egyptian bondage ; and yet this sign could not take place until the Israelites' deliverance from the Egyptians was completed. But it is called a sign, to assure Moses that the event should certainly take place, and that it should not fail through his insufficiency or misconduct ; for God would be with him, and enable him to perform this arduous undertaking. In the same sense the word sign is used, 1 Sam. ii. 34. and also, 2 Kings, xix. 29. In like manner, the promise in the text, that a virgin should conceive and bear a son, is a sign, because it was an absolute and unconditional promise, which could not fail of its accomplishment, through the wickedness or misconduct of the Jewish nation. And it must afford great consolation to the pious Jews in the hour of distress ; for it was to them a sign, or an infallible *proof*, that these confederate kings could not destroy them, because they must remain a distinct people until this glorious person should be born of a virgin.

Before I proceed any further, I would rectify an error or two in our English translation of the passage before us. For instance, I would read the fifteenth verse thus, "Butter and honey shall he eat, until he know to refuse the evil and choose the good." Mr. Pool informs us that divers learned men so interpret it, and among others, the ancient Chaldee paraphrase. The Seventy

translate it, 'Butter and honey shall he eat, *before* he know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.' Now we are informed that butter and honey were the common food given by the Jews to their young children, for their nourishment and support; so that the sense is, that this child, though conceived in a supernatural way, should be fed with the common food of other children, until he arrived at the age of discretion. The particle in the sixteenth verse, which our translators render *for*, is sometimes translated *although*, or *yea*; and instead of *the* child, I would read *this* child, which is an exact and literal translation of the Hebrew word; and then the text will read thus, '*yea* before this child, or, *although* before this child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' The child here spoken of, I apprehend, was the prophet's own child, which he then held in his arms, and which he was ordered to carry with him for a sign to Ahaz and the Jews, that the confederate kings should not destroy them.

For establishing the point before us, it is necessary to remember, that the writers both of the Old and New Testament frequently use typical, and symbolical, and hieroglyphical representations of things. Thus in Jeremiah i. 11, 12: 'Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond* tree. Then said the Lord unto me, thou hast well seen; for I will hasten my word to perform it!' Ezekiel xi. 13. 'And it came to pass when I prophesied that Pelatiah (i. e. the delivered of the Lord) the son of Benaiah died;—then fell I down upon my face, and cried with a loud voice, and said, Ah Lord God, wilt thou make a full end of the remnant of Israel?' Because he saw a person die at the time of his prophesying, whose name signified *the delivered of the Lord*, he took it to be a sign, that the Lord would make a full end of the remnant of Israel, even of those whom he had formerly delivered from destruction. In John ix. 7, the Evangelist observes, that Christ said to the blind man, 'Go wash in the pool of Siloam, which is, (says the apostle,) by interpretation *Sent*;' that is, Christ ordered the blind man to wash in a pool, whose signification was *sent*, as a sign that Christ was the person *sent* of God for the salvation of man. See also, Heb. vii. 1—3, where the apostle considers Melchizedec as a proper type of Jesus Christ, because Melchizedec signifies King of righteousness, and Salem signifies *peace*; and being a priest that was not descended either on the father's or mother's side of persons that were in the priest's office, neither having the beginning of his days, nor the end of his life anywhere recorded, he became a fit person to represent the everlasting and unchangeable priesthood of Christ. In Isaiah xi. 1, Christ is called *nazer*, a branch; therefore, in order to fulfil this prophecy,

* The Hebrew word signifies a hastening tree.

Matthew tells us, chap. ii. 23, that he dwelt at Nazareth, that is, the place of branches. In Zech. vi. 11, the prophet is ordered to make crowns of silver and gold, and to place them upon the head of Joshua the high priest. Now Joshua signifies Saviour, and is the same name that in the New Testament is called Jesus. He is then ordered, in verse 12, to speak to him, and say, 'Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the *Branch*, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit, and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne.' The crowns signify that the Messiah should be both king and priest. They are placed upon the head of Joshua for two reasons; first, because, being high priest, he was a proper representative of the Messiah; and secondly, his name (being Joshua, or Jesus) was made by this action a sign that the Messiah, when he came, should be called Jesus. Therefore the meaning of verse 12, is, as if he had said, Behold this man, Jesus, the true Messiah, whom I have formerly named the *Branch*. Under the law of Moses, the priest was to bear the iniquities of the people; hence, when God would represent to his people that he was about to take away their iniquities, the prophet Zechariah sees in a vision the high priest, Joshua, clothed with filthy garments, and the Lord ordering him that stood before him to take away from Joshua his filthy garments; and then the Lord says to him, (Zech. iii. 4.) 'Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.' This was said to him, as a typical person, who bore the sins of the people; and it signifies that God had removed their iniquities from them. And then, to inform them that the Messiah should, when he came, take away the iniquities of his people in consequence of his priestly office, he says to him, in verse 8, 'Hear now, O Joshua, the high priest, thou and thy fellows that sit before thee, for they are *men of signs* or *typical men*; for behold I will bring forth my servant, the *Branch*;'—that is, you priests, who now bear the iniquities of the people, are types of the Messiah, the branch, who shall, when he comes, bear the iniquities of his people. In like manner Ezekiel was a sign to the Jews of what was to befall them. See Ezek. xxiv. 15—24. And to come to the point before us, the prophet Isaiah, chap. viii. 18, says, 'Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders, that is, *types*, in Israel, from the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth in Mount Zion.' We have an account of one of these typical children in the third verse of this eighth chapter, whom the Lord ordered the prophet to call *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*; that is, *In making speed to the spoil, he hasteneth the prey*; and we are told in the fourth verse, why this child was so named, viz: because

‘before the child have knowledge to cry, my father and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria.’ Another of these typical children is mentioned, chap. vii. 3. ‘Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou and *Shear-jashub* thy son. Now the meaning of *Shear-jashub* is, *The remnant shall return*. The reason of this child’s being thus named, we shall find in Isaiah x. 21, *The remnant shall return*, the remnant of Jacob to the mighty God.’ Here *Shear-jashub* represents the remnant of Jacob, that should return to the mighty God. Undoubtedly, then, this name was given to Isaiah’s son, as a type, to signify that a remnant of Jacob should be saved. When, therefore, the prophet, in the text just now cited, was ordered to take this son along with him in his visit to Ahaz, it was that he might be a sign to the people, that a remnant should be saved, and consequently, that these confederate kings should not be suffered to destroy the kingdom of Judah.

I trust I have said enough to show you the propriety of such a sign, and that Isaiah and his children were ordained of God to be signs to the people. Now upon this view of the matter, we shall find three things that might afford comfort to the Jews, and from whence they might be assured that they should not be cut off by the confederate kings; the first was, the promise that a virgin should conceive and bear a son. This proved that they must remain a people until the promise was accomplished. The second was, this child of the prophet, which was ordained of God to be a sign to them, that the people should not be utterly destroyed, because a remnant should be preserved. And the third ground was, the express declaration of the prophet, pointing to the child in his arms and saying, ‘Yea, before this child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.’

I apprehend I have now sufficiently cleared this passage of Scripture from all the difficulties that attend it. For, as I take it, I have proved that the Hebrew word in verse fourteenth does signify a virgin, and that it cannot be applied to any other description of person. I have shown in what sense this prediction was a sign to the Jews, viz: as it assured them that they should not be cut off by their enemies, nor cease from being a nation, until the prediction should be accomplished. I have shown, why I take the child mentioned in verse 16 to be Isaiah’s son, and not the son of the virgin, mentioned in verse 14, viz: because Isaiah and his children were ordained of God to be signs and types to the Jews. When, therefore, the prophet was ordered to carry his son with him to Ahaz, it was ordering him to carry a typical person, whom the Jews were to look upon as a sign of what was to happen to them. Upon the whole, I look upon this prophecy as a glorious

confirmation of the truth of the Christian religion ; and that Matthew has quoted and applied it with the utmost propriety.

I shall now endeavor to express my sense of this famous prophecy, in the following paraphrase :—‘ Although thou, O Ahaz, through thy obstinacy, dost refuse to ask for any sign that may remove thy fears ; yet the Lord, in mercy to his church and people, will grant them a sign, which shall be an infallible proof that those confederate kings shall not destroy them ; for behold a pure virgin, that has ever been concealed from, and is an entire stranger to, the embraces of a man, shall conceive and bear a son, and thou, O virgin, shalt call his name Immanuel, that is, God with us ; for he shall be a Divine person, in whom shall dwell all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, being the brightness of his Father’s glory, the express and visible image of the invisible Deity. But though he shall be so glorious and Divine a personage, yet he shall not make his entrance into the world with any peculiar pomp or splendor to distinguish him from others ;—so far from this, during his infancy, he shall be nourished with the same common food that is given to other children ; for butter and honey shall he eat, until he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good, and shall arrive at the age of discretion. And for your further consolation, behold this typical child, whose name was given him for a sign that you should not be utterly destroyed, but that a remnant shall be saved and shall return to the Lord. Yea, further, let me assure you, that before this little child, which I hold in my arms, shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.’

Thus, dear Sir, in compliance with your request, I have endeavored to give you the best solution of the difficulties you have proposed, that I am capable of. How far I have succeeded, must be left to your Honor’s judgement. I have advanced nothing but what clearly appears to me to be the truth. The New Testament phrase, ‘ *That it might be fulfilled,*’ does generally, and I rather think, always, mean the accomplishment of predictions of future events ; but there are some very learned gentlemen, that discover an amazing genius in expounding many parts of Scripture, *who blunder most wretchedly whenever they meddle with the prophecies.* Whether this be owing to their having too great a fondness for certain pre-conceived opinions, or whether there is a particular genius necessary for the interpreting of prophecies, I know not. However, thus much may be learned from this case, that we ought not to pay a blind obedience to the authority of any man, however wise or learned he may be, because the best of men have many imperfections.

I am far from supposing that our common Hebrew Bibles are entirely free from all errors ; yet I believe that whoever will compare the Hebrew Bible with the translation of the Seventy, and

with the ancient Targums of the Chaldee interpreters, will find reason to conclude, that the Bible, as we now have it, is perfect enough to be appealed to as a standard by which to examine the Christian religion. I very much doubt whether the apostles ever took the liberty to shift the points and letters of the text in their quotations from the Old Testament, notwithstanding the insinuations of your learned Dutchman.

I shall transmit this letter to our mutual friend, Mr. Eliot. If your Honor should be pleased to send me any more questions to solve, I shall receive them with a vast deal of satisfaction; and if I find myself unable to remove your objections, I shall be very ready to own my ignorance. I hope your candor will forgive the inaccuracies of a very hasty performance. I should have taken more time, had I not been afraid, that if I let slip the present opportunity of sending it, it would be a great while before I should have another.

I am, dear Sir,

Your most affectionate friend,
and humble servant,

SAMUEL WEST.

Hon. James Sullivan.

ETERNAL DEATH.

THE kinds of death spoken of in the Scriptures are commonly reckoned to be three, viz: death *temporal*, *spiritual*, and *eternal*. Death temporal is the separation of soul and body. Death spiritual is a uniform and confirmed course of transgression; in other words, it is to be 'dead in trespasses and sins.' And death eternal is that future and everlasting punishment which every sinner deserves. Under one or another of these three classes, it is believed every passage of Scripture, in which the word death is used, may be fairly ranked; if we except perhaps a very few, in which it is used in an obviously and highly figurative sense.

Some have considered this enumeration of the different kinds of death unsatisfactory, especially as it includes *eternal* death. They have denied that any such kind of death is spoken of in the Scriptures, or will ever be realized by any portion of our race. The candid and dispassionate, who entertain this view of the subject (for others it is useless to attempt convincing) are invited to a consideration of the following classes of Scriptures in which the word death is used. And,

1. Those, in which a certain kind of death is *contrasted* with eternal life.—‘As sin hath reigned unto *death*, even so grace might reign, through righteousness, unto *eternal life*, by Jesus Christ our Lord.’—‘The *end* of those things’ (sinful practices) ‘is *death*; but now, being made free from sin, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the *end*, *everlasting life*. For the wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord.’—The death spoken of in these passages is set, in every instance, in close and immediate *contrast* with eternal life. Consequently it must be the *opposite* of eternal life; that is, it must be *eternal death*.

2. Eternal death is intended in those passages, in which the *wicked* are represented as *exposed to a certain kind of death*, to which the righteous are not exposed. As a specimen of the numerous passages in which this representation is made, I may refer the reader to the 18th and 33d chapters of Ezekiel. God here urges repeatedly, and in every form of expression, that those who persevere in holiness shall *live*; while those who decline to the paths of sin, and persist in them, shall *die*. But what is the death here intended? What kind of death is it, to which the *wicked* are exposed; but from which the *righteous* are exempt? Not *temporal* death, surely: for to this, both the righteous and the wicked are exposed alike. Neither is it *spiritual* death: for to this the wicked are not *exposed*—they are already *involved* in it. They are already ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’ What death then is it, so frequently mentioned, in the chapters to which I have referred? To this question, the ingenuity of man can furnish but one answer—it is *eternal death*—that death spoken of by the apostle, as the proper wages and desert of sin.

3. Eternal death is intended in all those Scriptures, in which sinners are exhorted to *rescue themselves* from their exposure to death.—‘I have set before you, this day, life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore, *choose life*, that thou and thy seed may live.’ ‘Make ye a new heart, and a new spirit; for *why will ye die*, O house of Israel?’ ‘Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, O house of Israel; for *why will ye die*?’—But what is the death here intended, to which sinners are exposed, and from which they are exhorted to save themselves by repentance and reformation? Not *temporal* death: for from *this*, repentance will not save them. Neither is it *spiritual* death: for to this the wicked are not *exposed*—they have *already fallen under its power*. In regard to *this* kind of death, there would be no propriety in saying to them, ‘*Why will ye die*?’ for they are *already* ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’ The inference therefore is unavoidable—the death here intended, which the wicked are exposed to suffer for their sins, and from which they can be saved only by repentance and reformation, is *eternal death*.

4. Eternal death is intended in those passages, which speak of a sin as *unto death*—which is never to be forgiven—and for the forgiveness of which the people of God are not required to pray. ‘If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. *There is a sin unto death*: I do not say that he shall pray for it. And there is a sin not unto death.’ The distinguishing mark of the sin here spoken of is, that it is ‘*unto death* ;’ or that it must inevitably terminate in a certain kind of death. But what kind of death is intended? What death is it, in which the dreadful sin here spoken of is sure to terminate, and which renders those who have committed it no longer the proper subjects of prayer? It cannot be *temporal* death : for this is a fruit of all sin ; and it is no reason why persons should not be prayed for, that they are exposed, in *this* sense, to die. Neither can it be *spiritual* death : for this is the state of all persons, previous to repentance ; and if none may be prayed for, who are in this state, then no impenitent sinner is entitled to the prayers of God’s people. The death intended then must be *eternal death*. In this, the sin spoken of is sure to terminate—it hath no forgiveness—and consequently prayer for those who have committed it must be vain. I observe again,

5. Eternal death is intended in those passages of the Revelation which speak of the *second death*. ‘He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the *second death*.’ ‘Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection ; on such the *second death* hath no power.’ It might be shown conclusively, from the passages themselves, that the death, here spoken of, is not temporal, or spiritual, but *eternal death*. But on this point we are not left to mere inference. ‘I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God ; and the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was *cast into the lake of fire*. *THIS is the second death*.’—‘But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone—which is the *second death*.’ From these passages, we *know*, that the second death is *eternal death*. It is that fearful and eternal punishment, which is reserved for the finally impenitent beyond the grave.

There are many other passages of Scripture, besides those here referred to, in which mention is made of eternal death. But these are such as will not admit of any other interpretation. They speak, not only a language which can be understood, but which, it should seem, cannot be misunderstood. And they assure us, on the highest authority on earth or in heaven, that impenitent, incorrigible sinners must suffer the pains of *eternal death*. W.

REVIEWS.

LECTURES TO YOUNG PEOPLE. *By William B. Sprague, D. D., Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Albany: with an Introductory Essay, by Samuel Miller, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.* 12mo. New-York: John P. Haven.

MORAL science is among the earliest subjects of human speculation. So soon as men begin to think at all upon abstract subjects, they turn their thoughts to the nature and tendency of their actions, considered as right or wrong, and as beneficial or hurtful to others. Such contemplations may be followed by the mind without intercepting the ordinary engagements of life. The hunter, the peasant, and the shepherd, may each pursue them without injury to his business. No laboratory is wanted for the purpose, but that of a sound head and an honest heart. Hence it is, that rude nations abound with apothegms and proverbs, which manifest a deep knowledge of the human heart, and of the tendencies of human conduct. Hence some of the earliest efforts of public teaching have been to regulate the moral actions; and there is no doubt that Pythagoras, and perhaps others before him, were preachers of what they considered to be virtue. Even among the Pagan inhabitants of our own woods, there is much of moral inculcation. We have heard with our own ears an aged chief giving to the young lessons of patience, mutual forbearance and discretion, which could hardly have been expected from a savage.

In that country whence nearly all the literature and much of the science of modern times took their origin, the discussion of moral subjects occupied, for many ages, a great share of public attention. Centuries before the time of Christ, different schools and sects were formed, which sought to rival each other in public favor, and to gain proselytes. This fact may show how strong a hold they had upon public attention; and, in passing, we may be allowed to suggest to the learned, that a consideration of the manner and degree in which the schools of Greece tended to prepare the minds of men for the preaching and hearing of a code 'founded upon better promises,' would well repay the labor of an investigation, which we think it has never yet received.

Up to the age before Christ, we know all that the unassisted wisdom of man had discovered concerning virtue. We are enabled to know this with certainty, from the work of Tully upon moral duties. We had been revising the studies of former years, and were led into a train of reflections upon the comparison of heathen and Christian ethics by a new perusal of that immortal

work, when the Lectures before us were received ; and the subject of them is well calculated to encourage the reflections with which we have commenced this article, and which we may be allowed to pursue a few moments longer.

If, according to the foregoing remark, the study of morals is an early study of mankind, we think it may also be added that, even among the uninspired, it has been a successful one. The difficulty with mankind is not, that they do not know, or cannot easily learn their duties. No thinking man can read the work of Cicero, to which we have referred, without admiration for the beauty, and dignity, and truth of the lessons, which he lays down for his son, and for mankind. Certainly the Gospel, and before it the Law of Moses, have given some rules of moral duty which, as if to show the superiority of their source, exhibit a moral excellence above all that Greece and Rome had heard. But the number of these is not very great. Socrates (or Plato) had gone so far as to *forbid the negative* of our Saviour's great rule of conduct between man and man. He *forbade* us to do to others what we *would not be willing* that they should do to us. Cicero plainly adopts the same rule,—a rule that calls forth our admiration by its approach to inspiration on the one hand, while on the other, it leaves room for the towering superiority of the positive precept of the Redeemer,—“so that in all things he might have the pre-eminence.” In like manner, the injunction in the law to remember the poor, the precepts about gleanings, the limitation of servitude to seven years, the command to deliver our neighbor's ox, and not to muzzle the mouth of the animal, and many others, attest, even in the reproached law of Moses, a higher and better humanity than was known to the philosophers of Greece.

This superiority in the precepts of the divine legislation is distinctive ; but it is not its most peculiar feature. The great peculiarity of revealed religion is, that by it, man is placed in an actual intercourse of discipleship and obedience to his Creator and Judge. This is an entire new head, in addition to all that the light of philosophy had revealed. It places man in a condition entirely new ; it changes the whole principle of moral obligation, or rather introduces a principle of obligation for the first time. Ethics, as a science, became as new, on the publication of the Gospel, as Astronomy after the discoveries of Kepler and Newton. We now receive rules written by the Creator for the government of those he has created. These rules are not the operation of natural appetites within us ; but something different from, and often in opposition to them. They are either not written upon the natural heart, or not observed by it. By him those rules are actually and especially given ; by us they are actually heard and read ; so that we find ourselves in the relation of subjects, and pupils, and children, to the God of all worlds.

In the next place, the laws of God are enforced by sanctions ;—by rewards and punishments. “ On these two hang all the law and the prophets.” If even the gross and imperfect legislation of man needs to be enforced by the powerful anticipations of good or evil, how just and reasonable does it appear that a law, which can embrace no shade of error, should be enacted with the highest sanctions.

Cicero had prescribed to his son the observance of justice and temperance. When the same great man came to arraign Verres before the Roman people, for aggravated violence, plunder, and bloodshed, in his government of a province, he reasoned from such topics as he knew ; and Verres no doubt grew pale from the apprehension of confiscation, or banishment. But when, in the next century, Paul appeared before another Roman governor, equally flagitious, he had been divinely taught, and he knew of other topics. He reasoned not only of righteousness and temperance, but of judgement to come ; and the rapacious governor trembled before a man in chains.

We have brought up the contrast of these two trials, not because it exhibits anything which is new, but for the sake of newly impressing truths which, however important, seem stale, and are almost forgotten. In the midst of overflowing privileges and redundant light, we forget how great those privileges are. If anything could impress upon the youth of our country the value of such a series of lessons as are contained in these Lectures by Dr. Sprague ; we think it would be a fair comparison of Christian doctrine proposed to youth, with all its magnificent hopes, and most solemn sanctions, and under the eye of a present God, on the one hand, and on the other, the brightest moralist of ancient days proposing to his son a system of morals, just indeed for the most part as to practice, but destitute of accountableness, unfortified by any reverence for the divine name, without pardon or purification for sins, and not adorned by any glimpse of immortal hope. Let the studious and ingenious youth then ponder upon the treatise *De Officiis*, and in that splendid system of heathen ethics let him observe that no higher reason is given for any duty, than because it is “ *naturæ hominis aptissimum*,”* and the like. The father can quote to the son no higher authority than that of Cratippus and the Stoics. If interest or passion should urge the youth to break over these barriers of reason, it is a case unprovided for, and the parent had no remedy. He heard no superior and revered command : he saw no stay of fear, or prop of hope, or smiling spirit of comfort, or avenging arm of wrath, to keep the steps of erring youth in the path of rectitude. When the whole administration of things around us is so manifestly formed upon a principle of retribution, it seems wonderful that the operation of this principle was not discovered by heathen antiquity ; or if discovered, that it was

* But adapted to the nature of man. Cicero *De Officiis*, Lib. I.

not applied to some more important purpose than to give zest to a fable, or bedeck a poem.

Taking their system of morals, such as we admit it to be, we have often tried to imagine what would have been the effect, if their poets and mythologists had adorned that system with imagery derived from revelation. If their Elysium, instead of being peopled with warriors drinking nectar, had been peopled with the pure and sweet spirits of the just made perfect, employed forever in studying the works, doing the will, and singing the praise of one all-perfect, just, and good Ruler:—suppose its inhabitants collected from all the scenes of great tribulation,—their sorrows assuaged,—their sins forgiven,—their tears all wiped away,—and this from unmerited and unexpected favor:—Suppose their Tartarus filled with none but those who rejected the just government of a kind Ruler, and persisted to mar the bliss of his creation—and were therefore necessarily held up as “ensamples, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire:”—finally, if the unimaginable realities of the judgement had been produced as the fiction of poetry:—how would the world of taste have pursued and dwelt upon the splendid pageant! How beautiful, and sweet, and right, if imaginary:—how repulsive to the same hearts, if true!

The plan of these Lectures seems to be to take youth in precisely that situation in which they are placed by the providence of God: that is, exposed to temptation, error and allurements. The introductory address, by the Rev. Dr. Miller, is conceived with great felicity, and is happily adapted to answer the purpose for which it is designed. The first discourse impressively points out the importance of the period of youth. The next three are upon the three great dangers which beset its course: The danger of evil company; of evil instruction or bad principles; and of a life of pleasure. The next Lecture brings into contrast the favor of the world, and the favor of God; and in the sixth, Religion is shown to be a principle, which ought to pervade the whole character, and as demanding the homage of the intellect, the heart, and the life. In subsequent discourses, the young are urged to embrace religion; their excuses for not doing so are met and answered; they are exhibited as awaking to its influence and embracing it; the personal evidences of it are examined, and the nature, qualifications, and importance of a public profession of it, are then stated. The thirteenth Lecture is upon Defence against temptation; and the four last upon Christian Decision, upon growth in grace, upon doing good, and upon the triumphant close of the young Christian's course.

Without any ostentation of method, we see in this arrangement something for the young in every condition which regards religion, or the want of it. The opening of the first Lecture is very striking. After stating the season of youth as the *commencement* of existence—

of a *rational* existence—and of an existence, the character and destination of which is *all in doubt*, the author proceeds:—

“Collect now the several circumstances which have been mentioned under this article, and tell me whether they do not invest the morning of human life with peculiar interest. It is the period in which a rational soul commences a career as unlimited as the existence of Jehovah, and attended by joy or woe which imagination in its boldest flights never conceived. And over the whole path of the soul’s existence, there hangs, at present, a fearful uncertainty; no one can say, in what manner these unfolding faculties are hereafter to be employed; whether in serving God or in opposing him; whether in bringing upon the soul a perpetual shower of blessings, or an everlasting torrent of wrath. Is that an interesting moment, when the experienced adventurer steps from the shores of his native country, and trusts himself to the mighty deep, to be borne to some far distant region? How much more interesting the period, in which an immortal soul commences the voyage of life, not knowing how much he may be tempest-tossed during his passage, or whether he may not even be wrecked on the dark coast of eternity! If, in the former case, the eyes of anxious friends follow the mariner as he goes off into the deep, is it not reasonable to suppose, in the latter, that the watchful regards of angels are attracted by the condition of a young immortal, whose character is yet to be formed, and whose destiny is yet to be revealed?”

The interest of the following extract from the second Lecture, we trust will justify its length.

“Another sentiment which is brought into operation in aid of a vicious habit, by associating with wicked companions, is *the dread of being singular*.

There is nothing that goes to the heart of a young man like “the world’s dread laugh;” or the idea of standing alone; or of being charged with superstitious scruples of conscience: and this is a principle of which the abettors of vice are always sure to avail themselves, in regard to those who are inexperienced. When a young man, whose mind has been stored with good sentiments through the influence of education, falls into their company, it is wonderful to observe how their invention is quickened for devising means for his destruction. They take care not to display to him all the mysteries of iniquity at once, lest it should produce a shock which should drive him from their society. At first, perhaps, he discovers in them nothing more than an excessive cheerfulness; and so far, he thinks they may be imitated without much danger. But it is not long before he must take another step; and if he hesitates and falters now, he sees on one side, a reproachful frown, and on the other, a contemptuous smile: one, perhaps, charges him with unmanly superstition, and another with the want of independence; or it may be, the whole fraternity of them set up one general shout of ridicule. At such a moment, I look upon a young man as suspended between life and death; and as the experiment which is now going forward may result, I expect his eternal destiny will be decided. If I could look into his heart at this awful crisis, I should expect to find it in a state of fearful agitation; and if the power of reflection had not deserted him, to find him proposing to himself some such questions as these:—“What step is this which I am now tempted to take? Whither will it conduct me? May it not ruin my character, and ruin my soul? What mean these counsels and warnings of my early youth, that now come knocking at the door of my heart? If I yield, will not the hearts of my pious friends bleed with tenfold deeper sorrow than if I were to die;—nay, will it not almost send a pang of agony down into the graves of my departed parents, who dedicated me to God, and with their dying breath charged me to beware of a life of sin? But how can I sustain the anguish of being singular? How can I bear to be thought mean and spiritless; to hear these shouts of ridicule, and witness these expressions of contempt? No, I will not submit to this intolerable burden: I will rush headlong into the haunts of sin, and endeavor to stifle conscience and drown reflection. Cease, then, to trouble me, ye recollections of my early days. Ye pious friends, who have followed me all my life with affectionate wishes and good offices, I can heed you no longer. I will sooner pierce all your hearts with anguish, than to stand alone and try to stem this torrent of ridicule. And you too, departed parents,

even if I knew I should disturb the repose of your graves, and plant a thorn in that pillow which sustains your head in yonder lonely mansion,—I could not bear to be singular. Leave me therefore, friends ; leave me, conscience ; leave me, every tender and endearing recollection ; leave me too, ye gloomy forebodings of future misery ; and let me sacrifice myself as quietly as I can ! I can hazard anything else, even the eternal burnings of hell ; but I cannot, I will not, hazard the odium of being singular !” I do believe, my hearers, that many a young man, who now sits in the seat of the scoffer, if he would honestly tell you his whole experience, would be obliged to relate the story of some such conflict as this which I have here supposed ; and it may be that there are young persons before me, who can recollect something like it in their own experience. But if I *knew* there were such a case, I should hardly think it premature to call upon you to begin even now to mourn for the death of an immortal soul.

The third Lecture is the most argumentative, and yet with little parade of argument. We extract as a specimen the head on miracles in which, arguing *a posteriori*, the lecturer puts his supposed opponent to account for known facts, upon any other supposition than the truth of them.

“ You must be able to show that the *miracles* of which the Bible contains a record, either were never performed, or if they were, that they do not prove its divine authority. If you take the former side of the alternative, and say that these miracles were never performed, you must still admit either that they were pretended to be performed, or they were not. If they were pretended to be performed, as recorded in Scripture, it behooves you to show how it was that so many competent witnesses, and among them the most malignant enemies, in circumstances the most favorable for detecting imposture, and for several years in succession, should actually have been deceived. If you say that they were not pretended to be performed, then you have to account for the fact that such a record of them as that which the Bible contains should have been made, at the very time when the imposture—if it were one—was most open to detection ; and that it should have been circulated first among the very persons who would have been most interested and most able to detect it ; who yet never even pretended to call the facts in question. If you say that the record of these miracles was not made during the age in which they were professedly performed, but that it was palmed upon some succeeding age, then you have to account for the fact that the whole mass of historical testimony fixes the date of this record to nearly the period in which they are alleged to have been performed ; and you have this additional difficulty to solve,—how a record of facts, purporting to have occurred under the observation of the very people to whom the record was first given, could have been received by them as a true record, when, at the same time, no such facts had ever fallen within their knowledge.

“ But if you choose the latter side of the alternative, and say that these miracles were actually wrought, but still do not prove the Bible to be a divine revelation ;—you have then to show either that the God of truth would give the stamp of his authority to falsehood, or else that these mighty works were performed by the aid of evil spirits ; for that they transcended the limits of human power, admits of no question. The former of these suppositions—that Jehovah has lent his sanction to falsehood—you will not dare to admit, even in thought. If you admit the latter, and refer the miracles of the Bible to diabolical agency, then you have this great moral phenomenon to explain—how the enemy of all good came to be so heartily and earnestly engaged in the destruction of his own kingdom ; for the manifest tendency of all the miracles of the Bible was to promote the cause of righteousness.”

Towards the close of the fourth Lecture is the following earnest appeal :

“ The consequence of your being brought before the last tribunal, and of receiving a formal and final sentence from the lips of the Judge, will be still more tremendous. At the close of this awful transaction, you will behold, with a be-

wildered look of agony, all above, beneath, around, vaulted with the funereal fires of this great world; and when amidst this final wreck of nature, you look out for a refuge from the fiery storm, no refuge in the universe will be open for *you*, except that dungeon of woe in which the wrath of God is to have its perpetual operation. Into that prison of the universe, that grave of lost but living souls, you will immediately enter; and there, in the hopelessness of unavailing anguish—there, amidst the curses and wailings of the lost—there, where the eye can fasten upon no object upon which the wrath of God has not fastened before it, you must run the dreary round of everlasting ages. The sentence was, “Depart, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire.” And is it so, that this prison is built for eternity;—that these flames are kindled for eternity;—that these bolts, and bars, and chains, bespeak an eternal residence in these vaults of despair? Will not some messenger come hither from yonder blissful regions, though it be ten thousand millions of ages hence, to tell thee that this long night of suffering will yet be succeeded by a morning of peace and joy? No, sinner, there are no such tidings in store for thee: thou wert sentenced there for a period as unlimited as the duration of God; and thy sentence is irreversible.”

The fifth discourse, which is upon the favor of the world compared with that of God, considers the various particulars in which the favor of one or the other may affect us; and institutes a contrast between the two in relation to those particulars, as they respect,—first, the formation of character; and second, the obtaining of happiness. The method and arrangement are happy. The following is one of the heads:

“3. *He who seeks supremely the favor of the world, even if he not only gains it, but retains it till the close of life, does not, after all, find in it what he needs: he who seeks supremely the favor of God, finds in it everything that he needs.*

“Be it so, that so long as the days of prosperity last, the man who seeks supremely the favor of the world, finds in it a portion with which he is tolerably satisfied;—though I doubt not that even then, the heart sometimes sickens over the meagreness of its enjoyments, and longs for something more substantial and satisfying: but let it not be forgotten, that in the calendar of human life are numbered many days of affliction. There are days of pain, when the hand of disease rests upon us, with convulsive and ominous pressure. There are days of bereavement, when the light of friendship and hope goes out in our dwellings. Above all, there is the day of death, when this earthly tabernacle tumbles to ruins, and the spirit which has inhabited it takes its flight to other worlds. Weigh all the consolation to be derived from the favor of the world in either of these cases, and it will be lighter than vanity. Can the favor of the world make you forget the pains which convulse your system? Can the favor of the world cheer your desolate heart, when your dearest friend goes down to the grave? Will any light break from the favor of the world upon the valley of death, to cheer your passage from time into eternity? On yonder dying bed lies a man, the grand object of whose life has been to gain the favor of the world: and now in this extremity of nature—this most fearful exigency of his existence, let the world be called upon to open its sources of consolation. Who now of all the children of the world shall go to that bed of death in the character of a comforter? Shall the votary of wealth go, and talk to that dying sinner of his splendid domains or numerous possessions? Shall the votary of pleasure go, and tell of some projected scene of amusement, where every heart will beat high with sensual joy? Shall the stout-hearted and impious opposer of religion go, and talk fearlessly about dying, and exhibit all the black infidelity of his creed, and press the awful thought of annihilation? Who will not say that all this is but an insult to the agonies of death; and that they who have professedly come on an errand of consolation, have only imparted an additional sharpness to the pang of dying? Go back, ye miserable comforters; this is not the place for you. Here are agonies to be relieved, which your presence only serves to

heighten. This expiring sinner pants for something which it is not for you, or the world which you represent, to bestow ; and because he has it not, he is stung by remorse, or overwhelmed with despair.

"Such are the world's resources of consolation in respect to the calamities which befall us while we remain in it : and if it is so powerless to yield relief even here, what can it do for the soul when it shall have passed into the eternal world ? Think not that all the evils to which men are exposed, exist in the present life : the most fearful evils belong to the condition of the sinner in eternity. But when he has once passed the boundary of time, the world, if it had ever so many favors to bestow, can no longer reach him. The influence of what it *has* done is indeed felt, not in the mitigation, but in the aggravation of his doom ; but henceforth it can do nothing either to lessen or to increase his anguish. Oh, if the favor of the world could satisfy every desire in the present life, yet how poor a portion would it be, so long as it offers no provision for a future and eternal existence !

"Not so with the all-sufficient God. When the arrows of affliction pierce the heart, Jehovah condescends to take up his residence in it, while it is yet bleeding and broken, as the Spirit of consolation. You may see what his almighty grace can do, in that quiet and uncomplaining spirit which delights to count up the mercies of God, on the bed of pain. You may see it in the cheerful submission with which the heart lets go the earthly objects and interests which it valued most ; in the serenity which settles upon the countenance, while the falling clouds announce that a beloved friend will never rise from his dark bed till the morning of the resurrection. You may see it especially in the sublime actings of that faith, which often enables the soul to hold sweet communion with its Redeemer in the valley of death, and to celebrate, as it were, the fall of the earthly tabernacle with a shout of victory.* And beyond the boundaries of time, when the soul wakes, conscious, active, immortal, and the world has no more that it can do, or even attempt to do, for the soul's comfort, their will flow out to it from the favor of God, blessings large as its desires—lasting as its existence. Tell me, ye votaries of the world's favor, what is it, when compared with the treasures of almighty grace ?"

The solemn appeal contained in the following paragraph, we could wish to be brought home to the heart of every trifler :

"3. And this leads me to say, thirdly, that *those youth who dare to trifle with the serious convictions of their companions, are in the very broadest part of the road to destruction.* They trifle with the immediate influence of the Spirit of God. They cast contempt upon the most benevolent work which he ever performs for mortals. They make a direct and most dreadful attempt to thwart the gracious purposes of heaven, and plunge an immortal soul into everlasting burnings. If I supposed there was a single youth before me who bore the character of a scoffer, I would say to him, Beware—beware how you ever speak lightly again of the work of the Holy Spirit. And possibly some of you may have been guilty of the essence of this sin, when you have thought little about it. When you met your brother or sister, whose countenance wore an aspect of anxiety, and you purposely threw out some light and careless remark, or perhaps cast a significant smile, as if in derision, know that that brother or sister felt it at the heart, as a cruel and cutting rebuke ; and know, too, that He who takes an account of all your actions, recorded it as an insult shown to his authority, and an attempt to counteract the influences of his Spirit. And when, as you were passing off the threshold of this house, you met some companion whom you had seen melted under the warnings, or invitations, which had just been announced, and when you took that companion by the hand and said, "Come, let us go and talk of the pleasures of the past week, or project plans of amusement for the week to come,"—know too, that you were then opposing the operations of the Spirit of God, and aiming a murderous dagger at the soul of your friend. I say nothing which is not the result of solemn conviction, when I declare, that I would a thousand times rather my dearest friend should come and trifle with my last agonies, and dance around the bed on which my cold and motionless body was stretched, and close my dying eyes with a loud peal of

laughter, than to have him approach me with ridicule, when my heart was burdened with conviction ; for in one case he would only chill the last blood that passes through my veins ; in the other, he might awaken everlasting agonies in my soul."

The following paragraph seems to us a happy exhibition of the fulness of the Christian character, as exemplified in the life :

"There are those who lay great stress upon the duties which they owe to *man*, who yet find it an easy matter to compromise with conscience for those which they owe to *God*. In their domestic relations, as parents or children, husbands or wives, brothers or sisters, they are in many respects most exemplary ; and are always on the alert to minister to each other's happiness. In civil society, they are active and public spirited, and are ready to lend a helping hand to the various institutions which promise to meliorate the condition of *man*. They are moreover generous and humane, and will never turn a deaf ear to the cry of distress, and will even go and search out objects of want and suffering, that they may administer relief. But on the other hand, they will think it a light matter to suffer their seats to be vacant in the house of God, and will regard the Bible as little more than a piece of antiquated furniture, and will hardly suspend their secular employments on the Sabbath ; and as for the duty of private prayer, or confessing Christ before men, they never even think of performing it. They are good neighbors, and good friends, and good citizens ; but here you must stop, unless you go on to say that "God is not in all their thoughts."

"There is another class—just the opposite of this—who perform with pharisaical exactness the external duties which they owe to *God*, while those which belong to their *social relations* are but little regarded. They make conscience of being in the house of God at least twice every Sabbath, and oftener if they have opportunity ; they publicly profess their faith in Christ, and unite with his people in commemorating his death ; they come regularly to every prayer meeting, and never shrink from taking part in its services ; they go, at least every morning and evening, into their closets for prayer, and in their daily intercourse always seem ready to admonish the careless sinner or the sluggish Christian, or to put forth an effort, in any way, for a revival of religion. And yet, after all, when you hear the testimony of their poor or sick neighbors respecting them, it may be that they have said to them, "Be ye warmed, and be ye clothed, depart in peace:" or if it has occurred to you to look a little more closely into their characters, and to inquire of those who have had dealings with them in the world, what testimony they have to render concerning them, possibly they may tell you significantly, that though they have heard that they were very good in a prayer, they have found them to be very hard in a bargain ; and it may be even that common report has superceded the necessity of all inquiry ; and that they have an established character in the world, for being not only unmerciful but unjust. If you should see them in the church or the lecture room, you might put them down on the list of those of whom the world is not worthy ; but if you should see them in the counting room, or the exchange, you would put them down on the list of those with whom you would wish to have as little to do as possible."

Long as these extracts are, we are desirous to give one more. We think we have seen much injury done to religion, by a certain positive way of speaking of conversion, and of the work of the Spirit in certain cases, as if it was a subject to be discussed by special skill. We wish to see these subjects spoken of with reserved caution, and as being things, the certain knowledge of which belongs to Him who searches the heart. We think the extract below, the last we shall give, well calculated to inspire a proper degree of caution in treating subjects of so much importance :

"1. The subject shows us the importance of being cautious in respect to the judgements we form of Christian character, both in regard to ourselves and others. We have seen that there is a strong tendency among men, to set up

false standards on this subject ; and instead of referring character to the only scriptural test, to refer it to some arbitrary test, which the Bible has not even seemed to sanction. For instance, you have a friend who has been the subject of pungent convictions, and then again the subject of glowing raptures ; and you speak to that friend, and of him, as if you were absolutely certain that he had been renewed. You may indeed have reason to hope that that is the case ; and there may be that in his general appearance, for which you may, with good reason, give God thanks : but from the nature of the case, you can never at that period *know* that he is a Christian ; because you cannot search the heart ; and because multitudes have, for a season, appeared, in all respects, as promising as he, who have afterwards shown themselves among the open enemies of the cross. Now, believe me, you will be likely to render a much better service to that individual, by impressing him with the danger of self-deception, and of the importance of self-examination, and of giving all diligence to make his calling and election sure, than by inspiring him with a spirit of self-confidence : for if he be a Christian, the former course certainly will do him no harm : if he be not a Christian, the latter course may serve effectually to seal his perdition. Or, it may be that the case is your own—that you are the very person who is rejoicing in the hope of having felt the power of God's grace. My young friend, I rejoice with you ; but it is right that both you and I should rejoice with trembling. The act of regeneration is indeed instantaneous ; but not so the evidence of it—that is to be collected by a diligent and long continued inspection of your heart and life. Beware, then, how you indulge a hope too soon or too confidently. Beware how you satisfy yourself with any evidence which is nothing more than calling Christ “ Lord, Lord.”

If, in speaking of this work, we mention the unexceptionable and classic purity of the diction ; or if we refer to the style of writing, at once chaste, yet not without ornament, vigorous and impressive, but still elegant,—it is not because we attach high comparative merit to this kind of excellence. It has its share of importance, however, in a work to be put into the hands of youth ; and there may be some, we hope few, who will estimate the value of the book by their opinion of its literary merits alone. Our own standard is different. We are indeed admirers of that pure, uncorrupted English, of which the style of our author is so happy a specimen. But there is a purity which we value much higher—that of uncorruptness in doctrine, and in life. It is, therefore, as an epitome of the preceptive, experimental and practical parts of religion, as peculiarly applicable to the season of youth, that we recommend this work, especially to the rising generation. We know of no book, among our vast variety of religious works, which professes to supply all that these Lectures furnish. They ought to be in the hands of every young person. We add our prayers and our earnest hope, that under the guidance of the Spirit of all grace, they may be the means of turning many of the youth of this land, and of other lands, from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS. *From the earliest period to the present time.* By Rev. H. H. MILMAN. With Maps and Engravings. In three Volumes. New York: J. & J. Harper. 1830.

WE have read this work with mingled emotions of pleasure and pain. It is a vivid history: the picture is touched by the hand of genius; but if art has heightened the coloring, it has also desecrated the subject. The imagination of a poet has been too exclusively at work, where a fervid as well as rational piety should have accompanied and influenced the researches of the grave historian. It wears throughout the appearance of having been written with great rapidity,—for general readers, rather than for critical scholars. This would perhaps be no objection in itself, but it has sometimes occasioned inaccuracies and great obscurities in the style; it has produced assertions that have no support in critical research; and not unfrequently it has led to such a hasty, indiscriminate conglomeration of facts and events, that the perusal of a chapter leaves upon the mind a confused, transitory impression. Add to this, a great number of typographical errors, the immense length of unbroken paragraphs, and the absence, through the greater part of the work, of marginal, historical dates, and it makes the whole book careless in appearance, unmethodical in execution, troublesome to the memory, and inconvenient for reference.

We have heard that the work has been treated, in some publications, with unjustifiable and undignified reproach. The chief ground of complaint—and it is a heavy accusation—is its alleged infidel tendency. While we attempt to show that there is some reason for this charge, we willingly declare that, in our opinion, the history of the Jews, considered principally in a popular light, was never before presented to the mind in a manner so novel, classical, spirited and attractive. We know not when we have perused any history with such thrilling and continued interest. Its author displays a brilliant imagination, fine taste, various, though somewhat superficial reading, and composes in a glowing, though often abrupt and careless style. The merits of the work are therefore considerable, but mingled with many defects, besides the important one of which we shall particularly speak. That part which relates to the destruction of Jerusalem is instructive and interesting. The whole of the last volume is written in a spirit of benevolence towards the suffering Israelites, which is calculated to infuse a similar feeling into the mind of the reader. The work is valuable also for its graphic exhibition of the manners, habits, customs, observances, edifices, worship, and character of the Jewish people.

Probably the author, in preparing this work, was not conscious of contributing to weaken or destroy, in any mind, its impressions in

regard to the sacredness and divine authority of the historical portions of the Old Testament ; yet we are compelled to believe that this must be the natural consequence of its perusal, unless great care be previously used, in pointing out and guarding against its dangerous tendency. Such an influence it would not exert, were the history intended exclusively for scholars ; or for those who, with firm moral principles, have had opportunity to go over an extensive course of reading ; or for those whose judgements and opinions possess the experience and stability of manhood. They could detect the ignorance of the writer, the weakness of the reasoning, and would be prepared to resist the insinuating influence of sophistry and doubt.

But the readers of these volumes will be confined principally to the younger and more inexperienced portion of the community. They stand first in the general series of the 'Family Library.' We can scarcely be too solicitous in our anxiety, or too severe in our judgement, in regard to the moral character of all books that are to influence the minds of our children ; especially, that are adapted to form or modify their opinions in regard to the sacred oracles. This consideration will make us more severe in criticizing this work, than otherwise we should deem necessary.

And here we might say much on the responsibility which that club of literary adventurers are assuming, who have undertaken to form a *Family Library* for the people of England, if not for those of America ; and on the caution which it becomes them to use, lest they sanction and circulate what is morally injurious ; especially, as the various works they may issue are likely, for a time, to be received by the public with uncommon trust and eagerness. Such a caution is not merely becoming, but obligatory ; and men of high moral principle, anxious that the rising generation may be trained to the service of God, would esteem it no common happiness to be enabled powerfully to subserve this purpose, by making the moral tendency of every volume published under their patronage elevated, vigorous and pure. It may be well at present for the American public to use a little caution as to the reception of the works which come forth under their auspices. They have lately issued the *Life of Napoleon* by Mr. Lockhart, which we fear may have been written with the same slipshod haste that disgraces the *History of the Jews*. But we would rather see the Harpers of New York pour from their prolific press almost anything in the form of historical literature, than have the American libraries deluged with such a flood of immoral novels, and romances of high life in England, as they *have been* sending through the country. If a bill could be passed preventing the importation to this country of at least nine tenths of the modern English literature, it would be a great and lasting benefit. We presume that thousands of our people, who scarcely know that such venerable Christians as Lord

Teignmouth or Wilberforce exist, are well acquainted with the character and manners of half the dissipated, degraded, licentious nobility in England, and ape them, as far as they can conveniently, on this side the water. Strange delusion ! that the citizens of a republic can condescend to be the admirers and imitators of despicable, titled, monarchical buffoons.

Mr. Milman could hardly have desired a better opportunity for communicating moral and religious instruction in an attractive form, than was furnished in the composition of a history of the Jews. He might have led the youthful mind to venerate its instructive exhibitions of the character of Jehovah, and gratefully to admire his dealings with the Israelites ; and he might have powerfully confirmed the faith of all his readers in the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures, exciting a deeper reverence for their sacredness, and a more heartfelt admiration of their beauty. We regret to say that he has done almost nothing of this. The solemn, instructive, and interesting lessons, to be learned from nearly every page of the sacred history, the reader may here search for in vain. We are surprised that a clergyman of the Church of England, writing for the Family Library, the domestic circle, should have permitted himself to degrade the tone of his work almost to a level with that of the merest political and worldly story. But he thought the world disposed to look with too great a feeling of reverence on the Jews, and everything belonging to them ;—he has certainly been very successful in making it impossible that such a feeling should ever spring from the perusal of his own history. “In fact,” he says in the preface, “we are apt, in our reverence for *“the Bible,”* to throw back the full light of Christianity on the olden volume ; but we should ever remember, that the best and wisest of the Jews were not Christians—they had a shadow, but only a shadow, of good things to come.” This is, perhaps, to some extent, a truth. But the evil, if such it can be called, needs a very delicate and cautious hand for its correction, lest, in our zeal to eradicate superstition, we weaken the ground-work of a rational faith, and destroy what is a just and necessary awe ; while we root up the tares, there is certainly some danger lest we carry the wheat with them. We hope the time will never arrive, when Christians can come to the perusal of the Scriptures, New or Old, without a deep, solemn impression that they are divine in their origin, and sacred in their character—a feeling, that while within the precinct of “the Bible,” they stand on holy ground.

The sanctity with which the pious mind is accustomed from childhood to invest the ‘distinguished characters in the Mosaic annals,’ is not without authority, and that, too, of a very high kind. When we look into the New Testament, we find them mentioned with a reverential regard, very different from the uncereemonious style in which they are treated by our author. “Superior in one

respect alone," says he, "the ancestors of the Jews, and the Jews themselves, were not beyond their age or country in acquirements, in knowledge, or even in morals; as far as morals are modified by usage and opinion." This is an extravagant statement; their writings alone attest their superiority. "This," said Moses, speaking of the law, "is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." A people who could relish such poetry as that of Moses in the nineteenth Psalm, must have been not a little advanced in refinement, as well as in piety.

Mr. Milman did not wish to meddle with theology—he had no desire to make his work a sermon. And "it is possible that, wishing to avoid the tone of a theological treatise, he may sometimes have left the reader to *infer that*, which was constantly present in his own mind." But moral and religious inferences, left for the reader to draw at his option, are rather apt to be overlooked. Here is one reason why Mr. Milman has produced a work, which, without alteration, is hardly proper for the shelves of any Family Library, and in its best view is rather a brilliant, interesting history, than a very moral or instructive one. Instead of making it an object, in the composition of his work, to strengthen the belief of his readers in the inspiration of the sacred oracles, to lead the mind to the contemplation of God, to point out the methods of his discipline with his people, to enforce the authority of his laws, and the sentiment of dependence upon him, and to make the heart feel the importance of obeying him, by the lessons which compel the attention of every man of piety, in whichever way the history, character, and prospects of the Jews may be contemplated, he seems resolutely to have retreated as far as possible from the consideration of topics so trite, and to have refrained from looking at his work in a religious view, lest he might unfortunately incur the odium of theological dullness. In his eagerness "*to avoid the tone of a theological treatise*," a phrase which to us savors somewhat (though we may be uncharitable) of a sneer at the character of histories, whose object it is to make men more pious as well as more learned,—he has almost hurried into the opposite extreme.

He has generally excluded from observation, whenever it could easily be done, the agency and interposition of God. In the preface to the second edition of his work, he labors to vindicate this course, and appeals to the authority and argument of Warburton, that God, in choosing a man learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, as was the Jewish leader and lawgiver, did it to spare himself the necessity of a perpetual interposition; in accordance with a principle of his moral government of the world, "never to do in an extraordinary, what may be done in an ordinary way." Now we have no great veneration for the character of Warburton,

either as a critic, theologian, or Christian ; but without speaking of this, we have only to turn the eye upon almost any page in the early history of the Jews—the history in the Pentateuch—to find that God does exhibit his own marked agency, necessary or not, by a perpetual interposition. It is therefore presumption in any individual to labor to conceal or keep out of view such interposition, and nonsense in the highest degree to pretend in this way to write a more *rational* history.

One would really imagine that Mr. Milman thought Moses himself too “theological,” too superstitious, too devout, too anxious to attribute everything to the omnipotent and omnipresent energy of Jehovah ; and so intended to improve on the model of the sacred historian. He keeps too much out of view the theocratical constitution of the Hebrews, nor does he commence the work with a sufficient exhibition of this peculiarity in their condition as a people. The sovereignty of the Jewish Commonwealth is practically transferred from God to Moses ;—this great lawgiver, who, in his own history, always acts by command from the Deity, and appears in a subordinate, dependant capacity, in Mr. Milman’s work acts for himself, legislates by his own authority, and almost performs miracles by his own power. In the Pentateuch, it is God acting through Moses as the instrument ;—everywhere an entire dependence upon Jehovah is minutely recognized. It is he who directs his people in their measures ; it is he who leads them through the wilderness ; it is he who gives them bread from heaven to eat, who brings water from the rock, who sunders the Red Sea, and rolls back the Jordan, who goes before them in the fire and the cloud, who protects his people and leads them like a flock. The 78th, 105th, and 106th, and 136th Psalms are not less beautiful for their spirit of deep devotion, their simple and confident recognition of the hand of God, than for the historical accuracy with which they have sketched the picture from the annals of the nation. This grateful, joyous recognition of the divine presence is what gives its inimitable sweetness to the sacred poetry. But in Mr. Milman, God is put out of the way—it is human agency, almost all. Now this is the very spirit of infidelity—an unwillingness to recognize the hand of God, wherever such recognition can be avoided, and a desire to shut up the mind’s vision exclusively to the notice of human means and the human instrument.

We cannot conceive what object is gained by thus excluding all immediate agency of God but what is absolutely necessary. Mr. Milman does indeed avoid the “tone of a theological treatise ;” but he also avoids the opportunity of giving solemnity, sacredness, and instructiveness to the history, and of sustaining the mind’s reverence for the sacred oracles, its source. We deem it quite unnecessary to entertain a more jealous caution for the dignity and grandeur of Jehovah than the inspired writers themselves entertain-

ed and exhibited. If they did not think it derogatory to the divine character to introduce the Deity on the scene, continually interposing by the exertion of power and authority, it is paltry affectation of superior wisdom in any man, to pretend, as often as possible, to get along without acknowledging the supreme agency, merely because the author of the divine legation of Moses asserts that it is a principle in God's moral government of the world "never to do in an extraordinary way that which can be equally effected in an ordinary." It should have been sufficient for Mr. Milman, that he finds God present and acting on every page in the Mosaic history : he should have imitated, in the character of his own work, this striking peculiarity in that of the sacred historian, without perplexing his mind, and hampering his piety, by the fear of falling into "the tone of a theological treatise."

It will be gathered from the tenor of our remarks, that we consider the Jewish history a subject of peculiar sacredness and importance, and to be treated, so far as the pen of inspiration has traced it, in a manner altogether different from that with which any portion of profane history, so called, would be written ; in entire subordination, especially if it be intended for youth, to the example of the sacred oracles, and with evident and perfect reliance on the truth of their whole contents. The pages of a work of this nature, a work to exert its influence on the feelings and opinions of the young, are no place for the discussion of disputed points, the examination of infidel objections, or the exhibition of doubts whether this or that miracle may not be resolved into the vagaries of poetic license. A man of piety and firm faith in the truth of inspiration would conduct the narration in such a manner as to show his own unhesitating and well-grounded confidence in its truth, and to inspire a kindred feeling in the bosom of his reader. A man ignorant, doubtful and unbelieving, is the last person in the world to engage in such a task—the task of preparing a history of the Israelites for the library of the family.

In regard to any other work, we should not have found fault with Mr. Milman for refusing to notice and exhibit, in a decided manner, the constant agency and the providence of God. We are conscious that in writing history, men have sometimes fallen into the gross presumption of undertaking to tell God's reasons for every event, and his intentions in every revolution of empire. All must disapprove the mistaken, presumptuous zeal, which pretends to explain the hidden, inscrutable arrangement of providence, and to reveal the purposes of the infinite mind. But with the history of the Jews it is far different. Follow closely the divine oracles, and there is no danger of mistakes ; exercise the spirit which they breathe and inculcate, and there is no fear of presumption, while there can be no dearth of practical piety. In "*the Bible*," the chart is already made for us ; God himself holds up his providence, with

its secrets laid open, and its springs bare, to our notice ; nor are we at liberty to pass it by as a thing of mystery, insignificance, or doubt. We are bound to remark it, and to draw from its exhibition the salutary lessons it is well adapted to enforce, without fear of falling into "the tone of a theological treatise."

Our objections are principally confined to the first volume of Mr. Milman's history, for with this, his guide in the sacred oracles has nearly ended ; afterwards he stands on much the same ground with the profane historian, and is not exposed to the censure, which he deserves hitherto. We fear the transition from the sacred, simple, God-exhibiting books of the Old Testament, to the secular, common, worldly, political, human air, pervading the pages of Milman, must be injurious in its tendency. The youthful mind feels there is a contradiction, and receives a shock. Instead of meeting with a full, unhesitating confidence in the truth of what inspiration has written, it finds a caution, a suspicion, a half doubting manner, a readiness to give credence to objections, and an attempt to meet them by lowering the claims of the sacred history. He finds the Hebrews, (we speak only of the first volume) another sort of people than the one he has been accustomed to contemplate as the chosen people of God, the subjects, though obstinate and rebellious, of a glorious theocracy ; he finds, indeed, in the manner of the whole narrative, something very diverse from what the Bible, the revered, beloved Book has presented to his view. We cannot help contrasting the work of Milman, in these respects, with that of Jahn. Jahn's volume is the production of immense, patient, cool, judicious research—a work for the critical scholar, and one to be carefully studied. In writing such a work, its author might, if ever with propriety, have presented it merely in a political aspect ; for it is not to influence the faith or guide the opinions of youthful, inexperienced minds. But this has not been the course he has chosen. He keeps in view, with a broad decisive mark, the theocratical constitution of the Hebrews—God, their sovereign and the supreme administrator of their state—and their entire dependence upon him. The influence of this work is to strengthen the convictions of the reader in regard to the truth and inspiration of the Old Testament history.

Mr. Milman's tone in the first volume, seems confident, hasty, and destitute of humility : at least, this is the impression we receive while he is on ground where the sacred historian has been before him. His unwillingness to receive the literal account of some of the miracles in the Hebrew Scriptures is very apparent. Did the author suppose it would make his own mind appear more independent, give a greater dignity or interest to his history, or add to its credibility in the view of any sober, judicious believer in the truth of the Bible ? He was certainly mistaken. Perhaps he sincerely thought it might convince infidels : this is the

more likely, since the preface closes with this declaration. "To conclude; in the works of writers hostile to revelation, the author has seen many objections, embarrassing to those who take up a narrow system of interpreting the Hebrew writings; to those who adopt a more rational latitude of exposition, none."

We have no desire to confine ourselves to a narrow system of interpretation; but we know, that of all impossible vagaries of a learned fancy, that of making the Bible a book which infidels will believe, is the wildest. As long as the spirit of infidelity exists, objections will be invented; it is vain to hope to prevent them by any concessions for the purpose. We may go on conceding point after point, and yielding inch after inch, till at length we are left with no ground to stand upon, while infidelity remains as rank as ever, and the ranker for our ill-judged attempts to make the dignity of revelation bow before its insolence. Unbelievers will but laugh and exult, when they see a grave and apparently learned churchman cutting down the miracles in order to meet objections, till they dwindle away into mere natural phenomena, or vanish in the poetical license of an Eastern imagination, and anxious to exclude every thing peculiarly religious from the view, lest he offend by the tone of a "theological treatise." Let the defender of the inspiration of the Bible take the highest ground; he will find it easiest to maintain. Let him enlarge his researches; they will prove the wisdom and the reasonableness of his faith. He will find that human investigations, the deeper and more thorough they are, strengthen his elevated position, and confirm his arguments in an increasing degree. Let him not be anxious to explain every thing to the contracted, distorted, vision of infidelity. If even the eye of *faith* meets with arrangements at which she can only wonder, to the sight of an infidel the pages of God's administration must teem with monstrous shapes, and be covered with a darkness that may be felt. Such a vision is no more fitted to scan the history of God's providence, than the fly on the stone in Westminster cathedral to behold the grandeur of the symmetry of the whole building; than the mole that digs in the earth, to measure the sun's orbit.

We shall notice some particular passages in the work, which appear to us objectionable. We have said they are principally confined to the first volume, and for a very obvious reason. Thus far the steps of the sacred historian have gone before the author, and if he departs from their course, it is an unwarrantable liberty.

After relating the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the author goes on to tell the escape of Lot.

"Lot, warned of the impending ruin, fled with his daughters; *his wife lingering behind was suffocated by the sulphureous vapors, and her body encrusted with the saline particles, which filled the atmosphere.* Later tradition, found-

ed on a literal interpretation of the Mosaic account, pointed to a heap or a column of salt, which bore, perhaps, some resemblance to a human form, and was believed, even by the historian Josephus, who had seen it, to be the pillar into which she was transformed."

We are amused with the confident manner in which the writer here describes the death of Lot's wife, just as if he had been an eye-witness of her fate. It is not impossible, indeed, that she might have been suffocated, as Mr. Milman relates; or she might, in her great haste, and while looking back, have fallen into a pit of salt or bitumen; but who will dare assert this? We have a very plain historical account by the inspired writer,—and why not believe it as it stands?

In his account of the passage of the Red Sea, Mr. Milman apparently imagines that a literal acceptance of the words of Moses, is altogether out of the question.

"Still, wherever the passage was effected, the Mosaic account can scarcely be made consistent with the exclusion of preternatural agency. Not to argue the literal meaning of the waters being a wall on the right and on the left, as if they had stood up sheer and abrupt, and then fallen back again; the Israelites passed through the sea with deep water on both sides; and any ford between two bodies of water must have been passable only for a few people, at one precise point of time."

He says likewise, with singular carelessness, that they began to pass over at night-fall, *probably about eight o'clock!* In regard to this miracle, let us hear the statement of a critic, who does not merely conjecture. We refer to professor Stuart, and quote from one of the valuable excursus, to be found at the end of the second volume of his course of Hebrew study.

"But in addition to all this, it should be stated, that the waters were miraculously divided by the power of God, and stood up, on the right and left of the Israelites, as they passed through, like a wall or ridge, Ex. 14. 22. This took place after the operation of the strong east wind upon them during most of the night, Ex. 14: 21. Of course, when the sea returned to his strength, (Ex. 14. 27.) these accumulated and elevated masses of water, suddenly flowing down, with the addition of the water that would be accumulated, in case the wind came round into the south quarter, would be amply sufficient for the accomplishment of all which is stated by Moses to have happened.

"I know, indeed, that the French legation, and Du Bois Ayme in particular, make the supposition that the passage of the Hebrews may be accounted for from merely natural causes; and that the accumulation of waters on the right and left of the Israelites, is merely a "poetic ornament," added by the writer of Ex. 14. 22. But then, our belief of facts like these must depend on the *credibility* of the sacred writers; for surely, the God who *made* the sea, can *divide* it. To dispute the question of their credibility, does not comport with my present design. I write for those who believe in the credibility of the narrations of the Bible."

The following passage in regard to the numbers of the Israelites, contained in a note, on page 119, of volume first, is still more exceptionable.

"It is by no means easy to reconcile the enormous numbers contained in the census, with the language of other passages in the scriptures, particularly, that of the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy. The nation which could arm 600,000 fighting men, is described as the fewest of all people; as inferior in numbers,

it should seem, to each of the seven greater and mightier nations, which then inhabited Canaan. And it is remarkable, that while there has been much controversy whether the whole area of Palestine could contain the Hebrew settlers, the seven nations are 'to be put out by little and little,' lest the beasts of the field increase upon the new occupants. The narrative of the campaign in the book of Joshua is equally inconsistent with these immense numbers; e. g. the defiling of the whole army of 600,000 men, seven times in one day round the walls of Jericho; the panic of the whole host at the repulse of 3000 men before Ai. The general impression from this book is, that it describes the invasion of nations, at once more warlike and numerous, by a smaller force, which, without reliance on divine succor, could not have achieved the conquest; rather than the irruption of a host, like that of Attila or Zengis, which might have borne down all opposition by the mere weight of numerical force. *We have not, however, thought fit to depart from the numbers as they stand in the sacred writings; though, if we might suppose that a cipher has been added in the total sum, and throughout the several particulars; or if we might include men, women and children under the 600,000, the history would gain, in our opinion, both in clearness and consistency!*"

We scarcely know which to admire most in this passage, Mr. Milman's thoughtlessness, ignorance, or want of ingenuity. It seems as if he wrote merely to show that he possessed independence enough to doubt;—it is wanton irreverence to the sacred oracles, to huddle together such crude and unfounded objections, and set them before his readers, without an attempt even to obviate them. But the reader has only to glance at a few chapters in Numbers and Deuteronomy, and to examine with attention "the narrative of the campaign in the book of Joshua," and he will at once be convinced of the looseness of this writer, and the complete futility of the objections which he, with such a grave tone of infidelity, brings forward. Is Mr. Milman quite certain that the whole army defiled around Jericho: or has he given the reason which the Bible does, for the panic which he mentions? Or has he read the narrative of the second attack of Ai, when the history speaks of Joshua sending away by night, to lie in ambush, so large a detachment from the main army, as 30,000 men—mighty men of valour—*picked men*, chosen from all the people of war? Still more—is it possible that the author could have had the ignorance to imagine that the Hebrews used *ciphers* in their method of notation? Yet such is the meaning on the face of this passage: At all events it shows a carelessness and a want of research which is utterly disgraceful. How much easier it is to scribble such a note, than to submit to the labor of a critical investigation—to examine with patience and pronounce with humility! And what must be the effect of such a passage on the mind of inexperienced youth.*

* This is not the place for an examination *in extenso* of the point, in regard to which, Mr. Milman has so judiciously displayed his want of critical investigation; nor is such an investigation necessary. If the reader will turn to the twenty-second chapter of Numbers, he will find a striking corroboration of the truth of the Scripture account, "*Behold they cover the face of the earth,*" said the king of Moab, speaking of the Israelites; "*now shall this company lick up all that are round about us, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field.*" In Deuteronomy, several of the 'greater and mightier' nations are described as nations of giants—their enormous stature, as well as their numbers, struck the Israelites with dread.

"The Lord your God hath multiplied you," said Moses to the Hebrews, just before

We pass by his account of the miracle of the Sun and Moon arrested in the Heavens, at the command of Joshua, though it is open to severe censure for the doubtful, hesitating style in which it is related. We can scarcely learn his own opinion as to the reality of this supernatural and astonishing event.

The following are his remarks respecting the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian host.

"The destruction of Sennacherib's army is generally supposed to have been caused by the Simoom, or hot and pestilential wind of the desert, which is said not unfrequently to have been fatal to whole caravans. The Arabs, who are well experienced in the signs which portend its approach, fall on their faces, and escape its mortal influence. But the foreign forces of Sennacherib were little acquainted with the means of avoiding this unusual enemy, and the catastrophe taking place by night, (*the miraculous part of the transaction, as the hot wind is in general attributed to the heat of the meridian sun*) suffered immense loss."

Now it is not impossible that the Simoom may in this case have been the instrument employed by the destroying angel; though it is rare indeed that this wind occurs near Jerusalem, as its violent effects are always weakened by passing over cultivated land; but it is curious to see this author defining with such particularity "*the miraculous part of the transaction,*" and with so much appearance of certainty in the limitation, when the fact only of a supernatural interposition is known to us, and the *modus in quo* is mere conjecture.

Mr. Milman's account of the death of Herod Agrippa, in the second volume, page 164, is liable to censure, because he passes by the sacred history of the same event with too little notice, and omits, indeed, one important particular in the narration of Luke.

"On the second day of the spectacle, at early dawn, the King entered the theatre in a robe of silver, which glittered with the morning rays of the sun, so as to dazzle the eyes of the whole assembly, and excite general admiration. Some of his flatterers set up a shout '*A present God!*' Agrippa did not repress the impious adulation which spread through the theatre."

He goes on to say that he was "eaten of worms." Luke, it will be remembered, relates in the Acts, that he made an oration to the people, and was smitten of the angel because he gave not God the glory. Jahn's account is much more calculated to confirm that of the inspired writer.

"On the second day of the games, he appeared in the theatre very early in the morning, arrayed in a magnificent robe of silver, to give audience to the

they were to pass over Jordan, "*and behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude.*" Had not Mr. Milman been so anxious 'to avoid the tone of a theological treatise,' the consideration would naturally have occurred to him that God intended, in all his dealings with the Israelites, to convince them that their strength lay not in numbers, however great, but in his assistance; '*not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.*' The moment they were unmindful of the Rock of their Salvation, one of their enemies might 'chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight;' a truth which is confirmed not merely from the history of the Hebrews; for such has been the experience of the Lord's people in all generations.

Syrians and Zidonians. "*At the close of his oration, the multitude saluted him as a God, according to the customs of that period.*" * * * Both Luke and Josephus concur in the statement, that the disease of the intestines, with which he was attacked, was a divine judgment."

To some, the points we have now noticed, may seem to be of little importance; but they forget the inexperience and susceptibility of the youthful mind, and the necessity of an early and unshaken confidence in the truth of the Bible. Things that are trifles to mature and ripened judgment, may be full of danger, when opinions are forming, and the soul is receiving a bias, to determine perhaps its eternal welfare.

We were grieved and disappointed to find, in this history for the perusal of families, the birth, the life, the miracles, the teachings, the example, the sufferings, and the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, all glanced over in the short space of a solitary page—noticed, indeed, in so abrupt, hasty, and general a manner, that the mind is scarcely conscious of the presence of Him, *of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write*;—him, because of whom Abraham was called, and the very Israelites were constituted a people, and sustained in their national existence through so many ages and so many changes, by the miraculous interposition and the over-ruling providence of God. The author seems to imagine that this subject belongs to the Christian, rather than the Jewish historian;—but its place too, is here,—and a man of deep piety would have made it the most interesting, solemn, and instructive chapter in the whole work. Instead of this, the reader is turned aside, with a dry reference to the pages of the Evangelists;—and Christ and his cross, the very life, centre, energy of all revelation—the story which the genius of the poet and the heart of the Christian might have united to display—they are lost from the volume; the reader expects them in vain, and the work goes on in the same vivid, indeed, and highly coloured, but soulless and secular strain. Others may regard the omission with a different feeling, but we deeply regret it.

It is easy enough to see, that Mr. Milman's opinions, in regard to inspiration, are very loose. "A late writer," he remarks in his preface, "of great good sense and piety, seems to think, that inspiration may safely be limited to doctrinal points, exclusive of those which are purely historical. This view, if correct, would obviate many difficulties."

We should more than doubt both the good sense and the piety which could dictate such an opinion. It is however the clue to our author's style of narration, particularly his manner of relating the miracles. The history gains, in his opinion, "both in clearness and consistency," by considering it in some respects erroneous. It obviates also many difficulties, to regard the purely historical parts of Scripture, as uninspired! These are creditable max-

ims, truly, for a minister of the Church of England, and equally so, for the Professor of Poetry in Oxford University! The venerable Lowth, who long ago adorned that office with so much dignified piety and learning, would have looked upon them with equal astonishment and reproach. We desire to keep aloof from the library of our family, a history of the Jews, written under the influence of such opinions, however interesting it may be in other respects.

SPEECHES ON THE INDIAN BILL.*

ACTUM EST DE REPUBLICA! The contemplated perfidy is accomplished; the constitution has been violated by its appointed guardians; and whatever may be its consequences to the Indians, a page of the darkest guilt is already written in our country's history. The passage of the Indian Bill has disgraced us as a people, has wounded our national honor, and exposed us to the merited reproach of all civilized communities in the world. If we go on in this way, we shall become a by-word to the nations. It will no longer be *Punica fides*, that points the moral of the school-boy, and tips the arrow of the public satirist with gall. *The memory of the wicked shall rot*;—but the memory of a faithless nation cannot mingle itself with perishable elements; can never stagnate in the forgetfulness of contempt. Ours will be embalmed, unless we prevent it by a timely interposition, in curses that can never lose their energy, or weary the tongue which utters them.

The world may now see what reliance can be placed upon the faith of a republic. Had we been dealing with a European community, instead of an Indian tribe, who would have dared mention the claims of selfishness, or the clamors of party, against the solemn obligation of treaties? The frown of the eastern continent alone would have intimidated the most reckless politician. But a nation that will cheat an inferior, will also, should a fair opportunity occur, overreach and violate justice with a higher power; nor can any confidence be placed, either in an individual or a community of individuals, proved to have acted, on a great and important occasion, rather as a furious partisan, or an unprincipled marauder, than from a sense of duty, or a knowledge of the truth. This is not the first time that the American Republic has shown a disposition to trifle with the sacredness of its plighted faith; it was all that the eloquence of an Ames could do, to keep his countrymen, in

* The speeches against this Bill are now in press in this city, and will shortly be published in a neat duodecimo volume.

the memorable winter of 1796, from the guilt and the dreadful consequences of violating the British Treaty.

"Let me not even imagine," said this illustrious orator, "that a republican government, sprung, as our own is, from a people enlightened and uncorrupted, a government, whose origin is right and whose daily discipline is duty, can, upon a solemn debate, make its option to be faithless; can dare to act, what despots dare not avow: what our own example evinces that the States of Barbary are unsuspected of."

When the subject of Indian rights began to be agitated in this country, it was regarded by reflecting minds as by far the most important which had occupied the public attention for many years. The apathy manifested throughout the nation as to the possible fate of these interesting communities was looked upon with anxiety, as an indication of the most alarming blindness or insensibility. It seemed to argue a torpor of patriotic feeling, a selfish indifference as to the treatment of a defenceless people, which was cruel and criminal in the highest degree. It argued a melancholy disregard of the sacredness of national faith; a point on which the citizens of a republic should be exquisitely sensitive—on which they could hardly be sensitive to a fault.

On a subject like this, no people can be made to feel deeply without information; unless, indeed, oppression enter their very doors, and come in a palpable form to each man's senses. No question, therefore, involving the rights, the property, and the privileges of a large body of men, ought to be discussed in a republican legislature, till the public mind has first been rightly directed to it and informed respecting it.

The subject of Indian rights was too long delayed, to admit of its being examined before the tribunal of public opinion, till it was on the eve of a final decision in Congress. It should have been foreseen and studied by the people at a period previous to the last election of their representatives, that they might have sent them prepared to vote for the nation, and thus have preserved a question of such vast importance from the possibility of being influenced in its decision by the bitterness of party prejudice. This is done in regard to such bills as the tariff; and why should a mere political business be treated with more solicitude, than that which touches the honor of the nation, and is to influence the lives and liberties, as well as the fortunes of men. In respect to the Indian bill, sufficient time was not afforded for the people to form and utter their judgement. Memorials were indeed numerous; yet the expression of public feeling was faint, compared with what the exigencies of the case demanded, and with what we should have witnessed, had the true nature of the bill, the character, prospects, and rights of the Indians, and the wretched sophistry of their enemies, been largely exhibited, and illustrated with familiarity and power.

There is, however, a portion of our people who cannot plead ignorance in excuse for their apathy, and whose course would not

have been altered by the greatest degree of additional light and information. The people of Georgia, or their leading partizans, know well the merits of this case; but there, as in some other parts of the country, the prevalent feeling in regard to the Indians seems to be not merely reckless, but inhuman and savage. If the toasts at public celebrations are not a totally false indication of the tone of public feeling, then what must be the degradation of morality and honor which could dictate or tolerate such sentiments as some of those delivered at public dinners, on the late 4th of July in Georgia? The style of expression adopted by some members of Congress from Georgia, in speaking of the Indians, is another proof of the cruel indifference and contempt, if not absolute hatred, with which this portion of our race are regarded in the scale of human existence. The idea of sympathy for their distresses, or anxiety for their fate, was scouted, as if it were perfectly ridiculous. The designation of "*poor devils*," applied to them by Mr. Forsyth, was an outrage on the moral sense of the whole community; an insult to the Senate; a contemptible taunt upon the Cherokee nation, which a child's sense of honor might have taught him to spare; a wanton violation of the delicacy due to the feelings of the Cherokee Chiefs in his hearing. With what a sense of wounded dignity, with what grief of soul, with what ideas in regard to Christian and civilized refinement, must they have departed that day from the halls of Congress!

The discussion of this bill in the Senate and House of Representatives produced appearances not often witnessed in the deliberative proceedings of a national assembly. In the Senate, the American Senate, which ought, of all bodies in the world, to be most illustrious for its dignity and virtue, was witnessed, not an implied, but a direct, disgraceful refusal to maintain inviolate the public faith. There was witnessed the evasion of an *appeal*, repeatedly urged in the most solemn manner, and intended to obtain a pledge, that nothing in the measures about to be adopted should be construed as denying the obligation of existing treaties, or operating to suspend their execution. Messrs. Sprague and Frelinghuysen, it will be remembered, both offered amendments to the bill, whose total and repeated failure placed the Senate repeatedly in this disgraceful attitude. The last proviso offered by Mr. Frelinghuysen was the following:

"Provided always, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed, as to authorize the departure from, or non-observance of, any treaty, compact, agreement, or stipulation, heretofore entered into and now subsisting between the United States and the Cherokee Indians."

This was rejected by the Senate, which thus publicly authorized the violation of its own most solemn acts. Mr. Sprague's previously proposed amendment was as follows:

"Provided always, That until the said tribe or nation shall choose to remove, as is by this Act contemplated, they shall be protected in their present possessions, and in the enjoyment of all their rights of territory and government, as promised and guaranteed to them by treaties with the United States according to the true intent and meaning of such treaties."

This was rejected by the Senate, thus publicly reiterating the denial of the President to the demand of the Cherokees for protection! We were astonished and grieved when we found that this avowal of a determination to break the plighted faith of the United States excited so little alarm and indignation.

The discussion of the bill in the House of Representatives, was attended with circumstances, if possible, more fatal to the cause of justice, and more discreditable to the character of a legislative assembly. For some time at first, the supporters of the measure seemed anxious; but all at once, their whole manner changed; their air was confident; they gave up the floor to their opponents, scarcely deigning to be present, or listening to them with the utmost indifference, and evincing by their whole deportment, what was known to be true, that they had brought about an arrangement among the members, by which they had secured to themselves a majority, before the hearing of the case.

Our disgrace and guilt as a community are great; and if it be possible, (which we will not believe,) that this measure can ever be executed according to the intention of its authors, this nation will be criminal indeed. In a mere worldly point of view, the plan in question can bring nothing but unmingled odium now, and incalculable expense and injury hereafter. These would grow out of the natural operation of the bill itself. Then too, we must remember the terrific consequences of blotting the national reputation, and breaking down the national spirit, involved in the act of annihilating the public faith. Individually, a liar is the basest creature that walks the earth: can the spirit of a perjured *nation* be less degraded? Still more, let us remember, this cause must be heard in the chancery of Heaven; and for a nation to incur the vengeance of that court, is an evil which no mind can grasp—no words express.

But in spite of its present result, the discussion of this question in congress must prove, unless all honor and humanity in the country be extinct, eminently advantageous to the interests of the Indians. It could hardly be otherwise, so long as opportunity of free discussion was not prevented. No course could be more fatal to the Indians, than silence on the part of their friends, either in congress or out of it. Truth, justice and benevolence, are on their side; the power of argument, and the power of Christian feeling; any discussion therefore, though ever so limited, if respectable talents are engaged, must be favorable to the Cherokees. Accordingly, if this interesting people are saved, it will be in a great measure,

through the defence their cause has received on the floor of congress, though that defence was inadequate to arrest the progress of the Indian bill, borne onward as it was by the concentrated energy of an inflexible political party.

The investigation acts upon public feeling, and public feeling thus corrected, reacts still more powerfully upon Congress. There is now not a pin left to hang a doubt upon. The cause of the Cherokees has been defended with such irresistible power of argument, that any man in his senses, who has but glanced at the public prints for the last six months, must feel ashamed to open his mouth in favor of their oppressors, or in support of the miserable sophistry, patched up for its excuse. We do not believe that a question ever came into Congress, where the argument, the eloquence, and the truth were so exclusively on one side. The speeches of the supporters of this iniquitous bill were as lame and poverty-stricken, as could well be imagined. Whatever of declamation they exhibited was disgraceful for its inhumanity of feeling, and its recklessness of truth; and every thing that looked like argument received from their opponents a complete annihilation. Notwithstanding the final result of the discussion, and the fact, that the resolution of the party had been made up before it commenced, and not upon any grounds of reason or humanity; there never was a nobler triumph of truth over falsehood. It would doubtless have been favorable to the cause of the Cherokees, if some one or two of the speeches against them had been printed in the coming volume. The miserable abortions would have operated as powerfully, by their own moral deformity, lameness in argument, and ragged, beggarly appearance, to produce a conviction of the truth, as the best reasoning on the other side.

This discussion is of great benefit to the Indians, by making known their *present* character and condition. The proofs of their civilization and christianity were before few, and scattered about like the leaves of the Sybil. We refer not now to the information obtained directly from Missionaries; there was enough of this to satisfy any candid mind; but it bore not the world's seal. It was the best authority, but from mere prejudice, was often discredited:—in its teeth and eyes, men persisted in asserting that the Indians were all *savages*! It is an absolute fact, that many in the community hardly knew that such a people as the Cherokees existed; and when this truth was with a good deal of pains discovered, an ideal picture of their state came with it, like that which we form of the condition and life of the earliest Aborigines. No reasoning, no statements of the truth, though backed by the testimony of the most unimpeachable witnesses, could uproot these prejudices from the minds, in some instances, even of enlightened and charita-

ble men. The sanction of respectable Senators and Representatives in Congress will, however, work wonders. When it was found that such men as Mr. Sprague, Mr. Everett, and others believed in the doctrine of Indian improvement, there was no longer any want of converts. It began to be suspected that the Cherokees were not absolutely wild; and that even Missionaries could speak the truth. In the light shed upon this subject, such slander and sophistry, as were palmed upon the public in the *North American Review*, appear in their proper nakedness. It has come to pass, moreover, that a man may exert himself in favor of this oppressed race, and yet not be suspected of fanaticism, or branded with the title of a meddling enthusiast. The most shameless presses are sparing of such epithets, when they fall upon able Senators of the United States, as well as on the respected author of the essays of Wm. Penn. We were gratified when we saw Mr. Everett, with the true dignity of an honorable mind, expressing on the floor of Congress his own respect for the motives and character of that gentleman.

Had the activity of the friends of Indian rights in Congress been instantly succeeded by a corresponding activity, on the part of their friends throughout the country, the results would have been incalculably more favorable. Delay and supineness have marked their efforts. It is the fate of almost every measure adopted in behalf of the Indians, to have been suggested and executed too late. When the final passage of the Indian bill was made known, the papers abandoned the subject; for a while there was a slight excitement, but it soon died away; a few speeches were published in a few journals, but most editors were too busy with the insignificant trifles of the moment, to allow themselves to bestow much attention on this momentous subject. Scarcely a newspaper has performed its duty; and now the topic is almost forgotten. A steam-boat disaster will awaken more sympathy and talk, than the alarming occurrences that are every week taking place to terrify, coerce, and enrage the Cherokees. Yet the *Cherokee Phoenix* contains, in every number, sufficient matter to awaken the public mind, if it could but gain attentive readers. It is but lately that, in reading that paper, we met with the following fact. It has been extensively circulated, but it will do no harm to repeat it here.

“Mr. Gray, a Cherokee, owed a small sum of money to a citizen of Georgia, who wished to obtain payment by law. An officer appeared with a writ, but being unable to obtain property belonging to Gray, and finding another Indian in the neighborhood, possessed of some cattle, *he seized them*, and soon made return of the writ, before a magistrate's court. The owner of the cattle thus stolen, appeared and stated the fact, but as the evidence of an Indian is, by the Georgia law, inadmissible against a white man, and indeed he cannot be received as a witness in any case, his property was sold before his eyes, and under the authority of the court, for the payment of his neighbor's debt.”

These things are not done in a corner, but in open day, in this

very republic, where we boast the security of our freedom, and the perfection of our laws. If we formed our opinions in the slightest degree upon preconceived notions of the Indian character, we should not be surprised to learn by the next mail from the South, that the Cherokees had risen, with the determination to die by the sword, rather than endure any longer the merciless tyranny of such state legislation. But they possess a patience which is truly affecting ; a submissiveness that no other christian nation would have shown. "We could bear reproach," said Mr. Storrs, "from the proud and the insolent ; but there is eloquence in the humility with which these people plead their wrongs. We feel our guilt in the very submissiveness with which they reproach us." Amidst all that they endure, there is wisdom, energy, and greatness of mind in their proceedings. We are mistaken if their dignified and spirited proclamation to the people of the United States does not produce a powerful impression.

This is a case of such complicated absurdity and wickedness on the part of our government, that the wise framers of the constitution, with all their extreme care, seem never to have had it suggested to their imagination. A cruel policy towards the Indians was the last thing which those noble patriots would have thought of. But *we* look upon it as though it contained nothing to disturb our security, nothing to demand our intervention. A whole people, free, from the remotest period, but feeble through the overshadowing growth of our strength, have cast themselves upon our government for protection ; and we have sworn protection, by forms as solemn as any with which language can bind a nation. Enslaved upon their own soil, and reduced to political beggary and disorganization, by the tyranny of a neighboring state, they appeal to the executive for the performance of our oath ; and he tells them, that the constitution will not bear him out in their defence ; assured and pledged though it be, in treaties piled upon treaties, some of them executed by his own hand, and defined to be the supreme law of the land, "any thing in the laws of any state to the contrary, notwithstanding." Disappointed in this appeal, they carry it by a solemn delegation before the United States in Congress assembled, and it is supported by all the eloquence and power of argument of which the truth is capable ; yet here the national engagements are not only refused to be sustained, but a bill is passed, enabling the President to co-operate with the tyranny of Georgia, in expelling them from their lands, their rights, and every thing on earth dear to them. The time passes on ; a gang of intruders rush in, and terrify and trample upon their people ; their persons are imprisoned ; their lives at the mercy of any ruffian who chooses to murder ; they are interrupted while in the exercise of their lawful industry, and forced away at the point of the bayonet ; all is confusion, terror, insecurity, dismay. Again the President comes before them, at this trying conjuncture, with

the proposition for their removal, and the declaration, that he can offer no legal protection. The very troops that were stationed to keep peace in their borders are withdrawn, and commanded to aid in executing the civil processes of Georgia; and the defenceless Cherokees are thus totally deserted to the mercy of a state, whose statutes in this case may well be said to be written in blood; to the operation of laws, by which they are annihilated as a community, and enslaved as individuals; to the rush, finally, of an army of miserly and impatient gold-diggers.

What is to be done? Had the slightest attempt at such insufferable aggressions been made upon the whites, what indignation would have ensued! And shall we be less jealous of the freedom of a people voluntarily dependent upon us, and in all respects independent of every other community? If the President absolutely refuses to perform his duty in such cases, we are fast striding towards despotism. Are the Cherokees to be suffered to remain month after month in the power of a state, which has abrogated their institutions, annihilated their political existence, and made them private slaves? Are they to be left exposed to all manner of rapine and murder, without the possibility of effectual resistance on their part, and without a single refuge to which they may flee for safety? And this too, while they have brought an action; entered a complaint against their oppressors, in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Republic? Why, we should treat the veriest gang of robbers with more lenity. While reserved for trial, they would at least be under the protection of the laws; and, though the violaters of all law, they would experience its power in preserving them from popular outrage, and in the enjoyment of a fair, safe, impartial trial. Here are the Cherokees, convicted of no crime, but in the attitude of a defenceless, injured plaintiff; subjected, all the while the trial is pending, to a daily and hourly renewal of outrages enough to drive them mad; and asserted by the Executive of this Government to be beyond the protection of the law!

We ask then again, what in this crisis, is to be done? If there are no means of bringing the Executive to a sense of duty, and of compelling the execution of our intercourse laws, then must this unfortunate people remain, here, in the nineteenth century, exposed to the slavery of laws, which would have disgraced the darkness of the middle ages; to the tyranny of a state, which, in this respect, is a despotism. Then must this state of things continue, till the tardy decision of justice from the Supreme Court shall have arrived—arrived, perhaps too late to be of any effectual benefit. We confess that such seems to be the melancholy necessity—we can think of no other alternative, unless the protestation of the people of the United States against these illegal proceedings should be so forcible as to bring the Executive Government to the immediate performance of the trust committed to its charge.

And of this there can be no hope, so long as the present apathy on the subject continues. We tremble for the possible result of such uninterrupted oppression on the minds and feelings of the Indians ; but we trust in God, that their truly Christian patience and humility will not be worn out. If it should, and they should be goaded to a sanguinary struggle, it would be the day of Heaven's wrath on their oppressors, as well as the signal for their own extermination. But they possess wisdom and forbearance, as well as a keen sense of their wrongs. Meanwhile, our citizens must be more fully enlightened in regard to this whole subject, and prepared to sustain the decision of the court, and to see that justice be done to the Indians, whatever may be the present exertions of their enemies.

The late singular order of the President, that the Cherokee annuity should be paid, not to the treasurer of the nation, as heretofore, but to individuals,* ought to arrest the attention of the most careless, and open their eyes on the true character of such proceedings. It is one consequence of the extreme ignorance which has prevailed throughout the country in regard to this whole business, that the great majority of our citizens have not known whether the President and the state of Georgia, may not all this while be acting in perfect accordance with the constitution. In his order respecting the payment of the annuity, he has violated the treaty of Hopewell ; for he has commanded payment to be made, in a mode directly contrary to that prescribed by the treaty.—Amidst so many treaties, torn into shreds, and scattered to the winds, perhaps an additional violation is of little importance.

The motives, which have led to this act, it is not difficult to divine. It is part of a plan of cooperation with Georgia, and evidently intended to cripple the Cherokees in their resources ; to destroy their means of defence, and of support to their Newspaper and National Establishment ; and to serve as a practical proof of the construction, which the United States Government are disposed to put upon the denationalizing laws of Georgia. No measure yet adopted is of so alarming a nature, both to the Cherokees and the people of the United States. In every aspect, it indicates a combined determination on the part of our Executive and of Georgia to terrify the Indians into submission, and if possible, to compel them to a surrender of their rights, and an abandonment of their cause in despair, before it can be brought again into Congress, or decided in the Supreme Court of the United States. In this view, the measure is indeed dangerous, it becomes us to take care, lest a result be hastily brought about in this business, which justice, honor and benevolence alike forbid, and which the people of the Republic would most bitterly deplore.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

* Average the annuity on the Cherokee individuals, and the proportion would be about forty-six cents apiece !

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Letters to Rev. Nathaniel W. Taylor, D. D.* By Leonard Woods, D. D. Andover : Mark Newman. 1830. pp. 114.

In these Letters, we have an extended and critical examination of a Note attached to a Sermon on Depravity, delivered by Dr. Taylor, in the chapel of Yale College, Sept. 10, 1828. Of this celebrated sermon we gave some account in the last number of our first volume, and expressed our satisfaction with it, *so far as related to the doctrine of depravity*;—believing, with the author, that the depravity of men is in some sense *natural*, and *voluntary*, and that, from the commencement of moral action to the period of regeneration, it is *entire*. We expressly waived a consideration of the Note, as requiring more discussion than we had then space or time to bestow.

Much has been said and written within a few years respecting what is called New Haven Theology; some claiming that the brethren there have made great improvements; others, that they are chargeable with dangerous innovations; and others, that they scarcely differ (unless it be in phraseology) from the generality of the Orthodox clergy of New England. The sensibility manifested on this subject, though attended by some unpleasant circumstances, presents one aspect which we regard as favorable. It shows a state of feeling very different from that in which persons may believe anything, or nothing, and still retain their standing and character as Christians. It shows the Orthodox community to be *alive* to the importance of *correctness in doctrine*, and that the lessons which Providence has read before them of the danger of gradual departures from the truth, have not been in vain.

The views of our brethren at New Haven, which have furnished matter of inquiry and discussion, relate chiefly to four points:

1. The nature of sin.
2. The state and character of infants.
3. The means of regeneration. And,
4. The subjects introduced in the Note of Dr. Taylor, and considered in the Letters before us.

We have not been unmindful of these discussions, or been disposed to regard them as of small importance. We have hoped, and still hope, that it will not be necessary for us to enter deeply into them, as it would be next to impossible to do this to any good purpose, without committing ourselves as partisans on one side or the other. The character of the gentlemen chiefly concerned is a sufficient security that all inquiries will be conducted with ability and candor, with mutual respect and kindness, and without any unnecessary disturbance of the peace and order of the churches; and that whatever benefits lie within the reach of investigation and argument may be confidently expected to be realized.

2. *The Political Class Book*; intended to instruct the higher classes in schools in the Origin, Nature, and Use of Political Power. By William Sullivan, Counsellor at Law. With an Appendix, upon Studies for Practical Men, with Notices of Books suited to their Use. By George B. Emerson. Boston: Richardson, Lord & Holbrook. 1830. pp. 148.

We received and have perused this volume with much pleasure, as it meets an exigency in the means of early instruction among us which we have long seen and known to exist. The youth of our country, when they have passed their minority, are expecting to assume high responsibilities. They are expecting to take a stand among the *sovereign people*, who are here the sources of all power, and sole judges, in the last instance, of the manner in which delegated power has been exercised. This being the case, it is of special importance that our youth be early and properly instructed, as to the frame of our government, the nature of our institutions, our political privileges and dangers, and the duties, rights, and responsibilities of American citizens. We are surprised that no more suitable means of instruction on these great topics has been furnished; and we cordially welcome a volume, like that before us, which has this object specially in view. It embraces the more important subjects, and is evidently written with care and judgement, and in a manner adapted to the capacities of the young.* We cannot doubt that it will find its way into most of our higher schools.

3. *Ordination by Elders Vindicated.* A Discourse, delivered May 12, 1830, at the Dudgeon Lecture at Harvard University. By William Allen, D. D., President of Bowdoin College. Boston: Peirce & Williams. pp. 43.

We have been gratified with the perusal of this excellent discourse, not so much as a vindication of the validity of our ordinations (though the argument on this point we think conclusive) as because of the fullness of evangelical truth with which the author has contrived to enrich what might be thought an unpromising subject. He first proves the independent existence of our churches, as founded on covenant, as distinct from parishes or towns, and as entitled to a free and separate agency in the election of their pastors. He explains the nature of ordination, and shows the validity of those practised in our churches—from Scripture, from “the judgement of the early Christian Fathers,” and from the *blessing* which has attended the labors of the New England ministry. Under this last head, he establishes the doctrine of the special operations of the Holy Spirit, in awakening and sanctifying the soul and producing revivals of religion, and then shows that these special operations have attended the labors of our evangelical ministers, thus giving “a divine signature” to their authority, and stamping them with “the broad seal of heaven.”

There are expressions in this discourse to which all our readers could not, probably, subscribe; yet all will agree that it is able and learned, and (considering the circumstances under which it was delivered) that it is a noble testimony to the truth, entitling its author to the gratitude of his brethren, and of the churches of New England.

4. *A Discourse on the Duties of Church Members* By Thomas H. Skinner, Pastor of the Fifth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: William F. Geddes. 1829. pp. 16.

A very useful, practical discourse—worthy of being re-printed and circulated as a tract.

* We feel grateful to Mr. S. for endeavoring to impress upon his young readers the importance of the Sabbath. There is a single sentence, however, p. 117, which we wish had been omitted. We do not believe there is any danger that the youth of our country will be *compelled* to keep the Sabbath too strictly. As it seems to us, the danger is all on the other side.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1830.

NO. 10.

COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF
UNITARIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND.—No. VIII.

DEAR SIR,

I must be permitted to trouble you with another communication relative to the *means* by which Unitarianism has been promoted among us. And here let me call your attention to the advantage taken by the Unitarians of Massachusetts of the existing *parochial laws*, and of the *decisions of courts*.—By the laws of this State, all the citizens are obliged to belong to some religious society, and to aid in supporting the institutions of the Gospel. All the inhabitants within the limits of a local parish or town are considered as belonging to the first or original society in such town, unless they formally signify to the clerk of said society that they have connected themselves with some other religious body. And when those who have signified their secession from the first society for any cause choose to return, they have usually considered themselves at liberty to do so, without let or hindrance from any quarter.* Thus much it seemed necessary to premise respecting

* It is doubtful whether those who voluntarily leave a religious society *have* any legal right to return to it against its consent, or *without* its consent, directly or indirectly obtained. Those who wish to see an ingenious discussion of this subject may consult the Appendix to Rev. Mr. Cogswell's farewell sermon to the South Church and Parish in Dedham.

I am a friend to religious liberty, in every proper sense of the term. I wish all persons to have the liberty of worshipping God, according to the dictates of their own consciences; and the liberty of leaving a religious society, whenever they become sincerely dissatisfied with its doctrines or its forms. But when persons have once left a religious society, I really think they ought not to be suffered to return, unless those who remain are willing to receive them. The religious liberty of one man should never confer on him the power to trifle with the religious rights and privileges of his neighbors—a state of things which must often be realized, where persons take the liberty to play fast and loose, to leave a religious society and return to it just as they please, in the manner they have sometimes done, of late, in this Commonwealth.

the present legal establishment of religion (for it amounts to a sort of legal establishment) in Massachusetts.

This State was originally divided into towns and parishes, and over these parishes were settled, with few exceptions, Orthodox Congregational ministers. In the progress of years, as diversities of opinion and interest increased, and full liberty of dissent was granted, from most of the parishes, there came to be a considerable number of dissenters. Many of these were among the most respectable of the citizens, who left from motives of religion, because they conscientiously preferred a different form of worship. But others were induced to leave from motives of less value;—some in anger; some, because they were indifferent to all religion, and were little better than infidels; and many, because, in connexion with another society, they could discharge the demands of the law upon them at a cheaper rate.

When Unitarianism began to prevail among us, although the clergy, in general, were first corrupted, and endeavored, by a variety of influence, to withdraw their people from the truth, still, this was not uniformly the case. Leading individuals among the people in some instances became corrupted, while the pastor and the church continued steadfast. In cases of this latter kind, the design has been not unfrequently formed, and too often carried into effect, to dismiss the pastor, seize the property of the church, and turn it all to the support of Unitarianism. The mode of procedure by which this has been accomplished has, of course, varied according to circumstances. The following, however, may be considered as an outline.

The pastor is at first harassed, perhaps, with a proposition to exchange pulpits with avowed Unitarians, or with some other request, equally trying for him to refuse, and equally impossible for him to grant. The effect of this is to produce discussion, excitement, and at length dissatisfaction, among a portion of the people. A party is raised to contend with the minister; and after skirmishing for a while and making due preparation, a meeting is called to see what shall be done. If at this meeting it is found that a majority is already gained, or can by any means be procured, to act against the minister, a tone of authority is assumed, and he is given very significantly to understand, that he must either submit, or be discharged. The unprincipled part of those who have before seceded, have been lying in wait to perpetrate mischief, now stand ready to return, whether the society are ready to receive them or not, and to make up a majority for the oppression and removal of the faithful pastor.

But if it is found, on examination, that a majority of voters, even in this way, cannot be obtained, a different system of measures will be adopted. The mal-contents in the society will them-

selves withdraw—setting up, at the same time, a loud lamentation over its broken and divided state—in hope of weakening it to such a degree, that the pastor cannot be supported.* A manœuvre of this kind may not immediately succeed, but it will be rather likely to effect its object in the end; as every secession, by increasing the expense to those who remain, holds out a temptation to further secession, and the friends of truth themselves will at length grow discouraged, and think that possibly another man may be more acceptable.

But when from this, or from any cause the pastor is dismissed, the society receives at once a great increase of numbers. Those who had left it come back in a body, and with them a host of old dissentients—nothingarians, infidels, unprincipled men, who declare that they were always Unitarians, although for a time they did not know it. Everything, in town and out, that can be brought to act in subserviency to the cause, is now rallied, and a desperate effort is made to secure a majority in favor of “the new doctrine.”†

The friends of order refuse to compete with measures such as are sometimes resorted to, and the desired majority is perhaps secured. A Unitarian committee to supply the pulpit is appointed; a candidate to their liking is employed; and a determination is manifested to effect his settlement. Meanwhile the church remonstrates, and asserts her immemorial rights and usages in regard to the choice of a pastor in vain. She is given to understand that she has neither rights nor existence, separate from the parish, and that if she will not act in subserviency to the views of the majority, she shall not act at all. Thus trampled on and despised, the resolution is formed to secede from a connexion, where she can have no privileges, and from which she can expect nothing but abuse and injury. The brethren meet; they deliberate; and, having sought direction from on high, they solemnly vote to withdraw from the parish, and establish the worship and ordinances of the Gospel in connexion with those who will respect their rights. In accordance with their vote (with the exception, perhaps, of two or three brethren) they do withdraw. The Unitarian ordination is now hastened; a venerable council is convened; and *by prayer and imposition of hands*, a young gentleman is established over the first society, and—THE FIRST CHURCH!! in ———.‡

While these things are transacting on the one part, the church and those associated with them, being driven out from their sanc-

* I do not object to the secession of dissatisfied individuals from a society, but to their secession for a sinister and malicious purpose.

† In one instance at least, not only a large number from other societies, but some, it is understood, from other towns, were induced to join the first society in a town, for the purpose of creating a Unitarian majority.

‡ Several *first churches*, like that here supposed, now exist in Massachusetts. As their claim to an existence, as first churches, rests *entirely* on a decision of the Supreme Court, they have been denominated, not improperly, *Juridical Churches*.

tuary and altar, begin to look around, and consider what shall be done. By their own sacrifices and exertions, and the needed assistance of friends, they commence erecting a house of worship, where they may serve the God of their fathers in peace. Providence smiles upon them in the undertaking; the building rises; they prepare to enter it; and hope their troubles are nearly at an end. But even in this last hope, they are disappointed. A suit is commenced against them by the two or three brethren who remain behind, in connexion with such others as have been induced to join them, to take away their property, their communion furniture, and even the records of the church. Relying on the manifest justice of their cause, they resolve to stand in defence of their rights. They go to the bar of their country, and plead there, that their property is their own; that they hold it by their own deacons, according to the Platform, to usage, and to law; that they have always had the entire control and management of it; that they have done nothing to forfeit it—nothing which they were not fully competent to do, and which has not been done by Congregational Churches from the first settlement of the country; consequently, that their ecclesiastical existence and rights remain unimpaired; that their property is theirs now, as much as it ever was; and that no man has a right to take it from them.

But,—I would that *truth* would suffer me here to stop,—but they are told, from the bench of justice, *in opposition to plain historical facts*, that “before the migration of our ancestors to this country,” and “for several years after they came here,” “there was *little practical distinction* between church and congregation;” that “*almost if not quite all* the inhabitants of the towns were church members;”^{*} that “*a church cannot subsist* without some religious community to which it is attached;”[†] that “the secession of a whole church from the parish would be *an extinction of the church*;” that, by *their* secession, they have destroyed their ecclesiastical existence; that they have now no rights or appurtenances,

^{*} From the three hundred and fifty persons, who commenced the settlement at Salem, the first church was gathered, soon after landing, and numbered only *thirty* communicants. Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. pp. 229, 230. At the first General Court in Boston, 1631, “*MANY who were not of any of the churches*” were admitted freemen. Hutchinson, vol. i. pp. 25, 26. Leechford, in 1637, says, “*Most persons at New England are not admitted of their church.*” Hutchinson, vol. i. p. 451:

[†] To what “religious communities” were the original churches in Plymouth, in Dorchester, and in Rowley “attached,” while removing, as ecclesiastical bodies, from Europe to this country? To what “religious communities” were the first and third churches in Boston “attached,” while removing from Charlestown? And the original churches in Cambridge and Dorchester, while removing to Connecticut? And the first church in Wenham, while removing to Chelmsford? And the church in Granville (Ohio) while removing, in 1804, from Massachusetts? And the African church, formed in Boston in 1825, while removing to Liberia? See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. i. p. 136, and ii. p. 393, and Boston Recorder for Dec. 20, 1825. To what “religious communities,” or parishes, were the churches of Massachusetts “attached,” before any parishes were incorporated, or any parochial power was committed to the towns? And such power, it is admitted, was not committed to the towns, until more than twenty years after the settlement of the country. A mistake like this in regard to plain historical fact was probably never before made, especially in a case so directly affecting the civil and religious rights of men.

as a church; that their property, their records, the furniture of their sacramental table, all belongs to those who have demanded it; and—that the “inconvenience” of losing it “will never be felt, where a case of conscience is in question”!!*—— They bow in silence, retire, and submit; but they do it with a sense of deep and complicated injury. They do it with a full consciousness that they have been wronged and plundered. They do it, feeling as the primitive Christians did, when called to take the spoiling of their goods.

I do not say that the whole of the above representation has ever been realized, in any particular case. But I do say, that it is a fair exemplification of the manner in which Unitarians have shown themselves ready to take advantage of existing laws and decisions, to promote their cause; and that, in all material points, the representation has been realized, in a number of instances.

The first church that was deprived of its property, to any considerable extent, in this way, was the original church in Dedham. In August, 1818, a majority of the first parish in Dedham elected the Rev. Alvan Lamson to be their minister. A majority of the church refused to concur in his election, or to receive him as their pastor. He was ordained teacher of the parish, but not pastor of the church, in October of the same year. Those members of the church who adhered to the parish chose him for their pastor, subsequent to his ordination; appointed deacons from among themselves; sued the church for its property; and at length recovered it.† From the Report of the decision in this case, which was delivered March, 1821, I have already quoted. This has since been referred to as a precedent, an *authority*, on which to justify similar perversions.

About the time of the decision of the Dedham case, the views of Unitarians, in regard to the powers and rights of the churches, seem to have undergone a great and sudden change. It will not be denied that the doctrine of this decision is in palpable opposition to that of the Cambridge Platform. The Platform proceeds on the assumption, that the church is a distinct and independent body; this decision makes it a mere appendage of the parish. “The church *cannot subsist* without some religious community to which it is attached.” “The secession of a whole church from the parish would be an *extinction* of the church.” The Platform gives to the church, in the most express terms, the right of electing its

* See Report of Decision in the case of Baker & Fales, Mass. Term Reports, vol. xvi.

† The events here referred to form an epoch in the history of the churches of Massachusetts. Those who desire a particular acquaintance with them should consult a Pamphlet, entitled “A Statement of the Proceedings in the First Church and Parish in Dedham, respecting the Settlement of a Minister,” detailing a variety of characteristic incidents, and evincing a thorough acquaintance with the principles and usages of Congregational churches; also the Report of the Lawsuit, 16 Mass. Reports, 488, and Worthington’s History of Dedham, pp. 112—115.

own pastor, and of holding and controlling its own funds. See chap. vii. and viii. But the Dedham decision nullifies and destroys this right. It is remarkable, therefore, that only a short time previous to this decision, *Unitarians were loud in their praises of the Cambridge Platform*. A noted Unitarian "Layman" of Boston, in 1815, speaks of the Cambridge Platform as our "religious charter," "our *present church constitution*." He says it "has been the *rule of discipline*, and palladium of our religious liberties, from the early settlement of the country." "Abolish the Cambridge Platform," says he, "and the Congregational churches will soon be found on a tempestuous sea, without compass, or rudder, or pilots." "It is worthy of consideration," he adds, "whether there should not be a *covenant* instantly formed by the friends of religious freedom, and of the Cambridge Platform, *for its defence against ALL SCHEMES OF INNOVATION*, [good] and a public *Convention of laity and clergy* of those opinions, called to adopt measures to counteract this conspiracy against *the church and its ancient rights*."*

Well would it have been for the churches of Massachusetts, if the "Convention" here spoken of had been actually called, and the proposed "covenant" had been formed. Perhaps it is not too late to attempt the thing now. After all that the churches have suffered from "innovations" on the Cambridge Platform, perhaps, the zealous "Layman," will now be willing to bring forward his "convention" and "covenant;" and his Orthodox friends will cordially unite with him in so important a design.

In 1816, the same individual issued another Pamphlet, in which he went more largely into the subject of the Platform and of church rights. "A law was necessary to call the synod which framed" the Platform; and their "proceedings were considered of no account, till *adopted by the Legislature*." The Platform "was *duly passed into a law by the Legislative adoption*." This is a true account; and here, if nowhere else, we have a *legal incorporation* of the churches of Massachusetts, with all the powers and liberties prescribed in the Platform. "So *wisely and judiciously* was it (the Platform) framed, that it *survived all our civil convulsions, our municipal and political revolutions*." It is alleged now that the Platform was superseded and nullified by the adoption of the Constitution of Massachusetts.—Our author insists much, in this second pamphlet, on the *independence* of the churches, and quotes with approbation the following account of the Brownists, who, he says, "were, in fact, the *same church*" as the Independents or Congregationalists. "The whole power of admitting and receiving members, with the decision of all controversies, was lodged in the brotherhood. As *the vote of the brotherhood made*

* Are you a Christian or a Calvinist? pp. 70—72.

a man a minister so the same power could discharge him from the office." "In a word, every church, in a Brownist model, is a BODY CORPORATE, having full power to do everything which the good of the society, [the brotherhood] requires."*

These pamphlets were written by a leading Unitarian, and were published, we may presume, with the approbation of his brethren. No complaint was ever made of the views expressed in them, relative to the Platform and the rights of the churches. The public will perceive, therefore, that between the years 1816 and 1821, the opinions of leading Unitarians, in regard to church rights, must have undergone a total and most surprising change.

Other evidence of such a change may be gathered from the Result of the Council convened to ordain Mr. Lamson.

"The Council here convened do indeed esteem the concurrence of the church and parish in the settlement of a minister as very desirable; but they believe that EACH OF THESE BODIES HAS A RIGHT TO ELECT A PASTOR FOR ITSELF, when it shall be satisfied that its own welfare, and the general interests of religion, require the measure; THIS RIGHT BEING SECURED TO THE CHURCH BY THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF CONGREGATIONAL POLITY, and to the parish by the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth, as well as by the free principles of the same polity, and of the Gospel of Christ."†

The Committee of Council, who prepared this Result, were Doctors Reed, Kirkland, Channing, and Lowell, and Hon. John Davis. Do these gentlemen, and other leading Unitarians who acted with them, now believe, that the "right to elect a pastor for itself," separate from the parish, is "secured to the church by the *essential principles of Congregational polity*?" Or does their practice evince that, for some cause or other, their opinions on this subject have totally changed?

We have further evidence of this change in the fact, that those members of the church who adhered to Mr. Lamson, who claimed to be the church, and who doubtless voted for him previous to settlement as members of the parish, thought it necessary, shortly after his ordination, to hold a meeting, and *elect him pastor of the church*. Would a meeting of this kind‡ be thought necessary, in

* Inquiry into the Right to change the Ecc. Constitution of the Cong. churches of Mass. pp. 28—30. Notes, p. ii.

† Statement of Proceedings, &c. p. 48.

‡ The account of this meeting, in the Pamphlet entitled "A Statement of Proceedings," &c., ought not to be wholly omitted. On the 13th of November, Mr. Lamson exchanged with Mr. Bradford, of Roxbury, who gave notice that there was to be a church meeting at the close of the afternoon service, for the purpose of *electing a pastor and scribe*, and of admitting the Rev. Mr. Lamson a member of this church." "Those who were present at this meeting, and were willing to take part in such proceedings, 'voted that they would have Mr. Lamson for Pastor and Scribe of this church,' and 'a Committee was sent to bring him in, to act *his* part. But how could that be? He preached at Roxbury, four miles off? We will relate how it was. He cut short his exercise there to half the usual time, and the moment he had done, seized his horse, and drove with the utmost impetuosity and violence the whole distance from Roxbury to Dedham, in such a manner as no man of any gravity or self-respect would do at any time.'" "His zeal carried him so fast, that he arrived ten minutes before the close of the public service. He came in and declared his acceptance of the office, and was then voted a member of the church." pp. 85, 86.

similar circumstances, now? Now, the members of the church are given to understand, that it is enough for them to vote in connexion with the parish. And if they are out-voted, or do not choose to vote at all, it is of no importance. The Parish have a right to settle whom they will, and the man settled by them is, *ipso facto*, pastor of the church.

The first open indication of the change here spoken of, is an article in the *Christian Disciple* for July and August, 1820. It was there insisted that, in the early ages of Christianity, there were no church members in distinction from the whole congregation; that church and parish were convertible terms; and that the Pastor was chosen in a meeting of all the people. The Platform was attacked expressly, as making the church too "aristocratical," and the practice of Congregational churches from their first establishment was condemned, as "unlawful" in itself, and "utterly unknown in the primitive church." In short, the entire scope and design of the article here spoken of was to abolish the church, or to make it, at best, but a mere appendage of the congregation. The decision of the Dedham case followed, in a few months after the publication of this article, and was little more than an echo of the sentiments contained in it, expressed in a more official form. From that time to the present, Unitarians seem to have had but one opinion in regard to the rights and privileges of the churches. The Platform, recently so much extolled, is given to the winds; the "right of the church to elect a Pastor for itself," secured to it "by *the essential principles of Congregational polity*," is forgotten; the prerogative of the parish swallows up everything; and the church is nothing and can do nothing but in subserviency to its will. On the principles assumed in the Dedham case, one church after another has been stripped of its property and rights; and when measures of this sort are to terminate, and the odious work of oppression cease, the Disposer above alone can tell.

It is doubtful, however, whether the cause of Unitarianism has been at all promoted, or ever can be, by the seizure of church funds. It is doubtful whether large parochial funds, when *honestly* obtained, are ordinarily beneficial to those religious societies which possess them. It may well admit of a question, whether, by diminishing interest, fostering negligence, and inducing a spirit of sloth and security, they are not of more real detriment than advantage.

But it does not admit of a question, that there is a God who ruleth in the earth, who hateth oppression, and whose curse will follow the possessors of dishonest gain. Individuals, amenable to a *future* judgement, he may suffer to prosper for a season in their sins; but communities, societies, and especially those of a religious nature, must expect their retribution here. The instances in which parishes have attempted to enrich themselves from the spoil

of churches are yet too recent to admit of a general appeal to facts. The wise observer will however conclude, from *existing appearances*, that their judgement, in some cases, does not linger.

INVESTIGATOR.

INEFFICACY OF DEATH-BED REPENTANCE.

AMIDST all the wonders of Calvary, scarcely anything occurred more wonderful than the repentance of a dying malefactor. By the same tribunal at which our blessed Lord was condemned to die, it was decreed that two thieves should suffer with him, the one on the right hand, the other on the left. Their characters, previous to that time, had, for aught that appears, been alike : both carried, even to the cross, a spirit of malignant hatred against the divine sufferer, with whom they were to share the agonies of crucifixion. But almost in their last hour, God, in the sovereignty of his grace, was pleased to make a wonderful distinction between them. One, for aught we can perceive, remained hardened in his guilt, persevered in his enmity to the dying Saviour, and carried with him into eternity the spirit of a reprobate. The other became convinced of his guilt, and had his heart softened to the impressions of godly sorrow : he cast an eye of faith towards the divine Saviour, while in the act of dying for the redemption of the world ; and the Saviour had compassion upon him, and gave him an assurance of his favor and mercy. " Lord, remember me," said the penitent thief, " when thou comest into thy kingdom." The Saviour answered, " To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Here, then, was a case, in which an open and flagrant sinner became a true penitent, near the close, probably in the last hour, of his life. His sins were forgiven him while he was on the threshold of eternity ; and when the agony of crucifixion was over, his triumphing spirit, washed, and justified, and sanctified, went to mingle with the spirits of the just.

' And is not here,' some one may ask, ' an instance recorded in Scripture of death-bed repentance ? And if the blessed Redeemer was ready to extend his compassion to the repenting thief in his expiring moments, why may not others repent and be forgiven in similar circumstances ?'—Whoever asks this question in sincerity, has sadly perverted this incident ; for the most that can legitimately be collected from it is, that repentance, at the close of life, is not impossible. There is an awful fact to be considered in connexion with it—it is that it is the only instance of repentance at the close

of life, recorded in the Bible ; so that the fair conclusion from this very incident is, that forgiveness of sin in a dying hour is an exceedingly rare dispensation ; and that in almost every instance, *those appearances that would seem to indicate it, are probably delusive.* It may be worth while to dwell a little on some considerations, illustrative of this sentiment.

Let it be remembered, then, in the first place, that there is *no more* reason to suppose that God will enable the sinner to repent in the hour of death, than at any preceding period ; and the fact that he has come through life without repentance, furnishes a strong presumption that he will go through death without it.

It is a truth never to be forgotten that, though man is a moral agent, and as such his actions are entirely his own, yet he is also a dependent being ; and there is nothing in relation to which it is more true that God acts as a Sovereign, than in the bestowment of that grace which is connected with salvation. But this is a truth which men, in making their calculations for death-bed repentance, entirely overlook. They proceed on the false supposition that the work of their salvation depends upon themselves alone ; and that they may as well bring their powers into exercise in the way of repentance for the first time in the last hour of their lives, as at any preceding period. But the truth is, as has been stated, that they are, in an important sense, dependent on the grace of God ; and they have no reason to believe, because he has nowhere told them, that he will be more ready to grant them that grace in the hour of death, than while they are in the vigor of life and health. So far as the agency of God is concerned, then, there is not a week, or a month, or an hour in their whole life, but is as likely to witness their return to God, as is the closing hour of their probation. But how many hours, and weeks, and months, have they passed, without having ever felt the efficacy of renewing grace ! How slender the probability, then—how few, according to human calculation, the chances, that this grace should be extended to them, just at the moment when flesh and heart are failing !

But it may be imagined that there is something in the approach of death, which is peculiarly fitted to rouse the sinner to action, and bring him to repentance. True it is, that there is much in this event that is adapted to wake up in the breast a spirit of anxiety and alarm : there is a terror in the thought, that the last moments of probation are on the wing, and the scenes of an awful retribution just opening upon the spirit, which it is not easy for the most hardened sinner to resist. Yes, it is admitted that the dying bed is a place for alarm, and trembling, and horror ; but it is denied that there is any natural, much less any necessary, connexion between these emotions, and that great change of character which we call repentance. The inhabitants of the world of wo have these emotions in a far greater degree, than it is possible any sinner should

feel them here : but amidst all their writhings, and tossings, and convulsions, there is not the semblance of a feeling which approaches to that godly sorrow which is unto life. They 'gnaw their tongues for pain, and blaspheme the God of heaven,' but 'repent not of their deeds.' No doubt that a sense of the wrath of God against sin, enters into the nature of that conviction which is preparatory to true repentance : but who does not know that the highest degree of religious terror *may* exist, often *does* exist, in the present life, and yet the soul remain as dead in trespasses and sins as ever ?

I have said that there is not *more* reason to suppose that God in his sovereignty will grant grace to the sinner to repent in the hour of death, than at any preceding period : I now go farther, and say, that there is *much less*. Far be it from me to assign a limit to the mercy of God : but let it never be forgotten that infinite mercy is exercised only in consistency with infinite wisdom. Is it not, then, contrary to all just notions of the divine government, to suppose that, in the ordinary course of his providence, God should call sinners into his kingdom, just at the close of their probation ? Is it not rational to conclude that, if he ever designs to make them subjects of his grace, he should do it, in ordinary cases, before life is nearly spent, that they may have opportunity to labor in the advancement of his cause ? How improbable that he should suffer them to sin away the whole period which was given to be devoted to his service, and just at the moment of their departure, make them the monuments of his renewing grace, and take them to heaven ! That individual cases of this kind may occur, it were rash to deny ; but surely we must regard them as exceedingly rare dispensations ; as little less than miracles of mercy ; as variations from God's ordinary procedure for which *He* doubtless has good reason, but before which it becomes *us* silently and reverently to bow. And tell me, whether what passes under our observation in respect to the subjects of divine grace, is not in exact accordance with these remarks ? We know, indeed, that some are converted after they have reached the period of manhood ; and here and there one, in the ranks of old age ; but far the greater number who ever give evidence of being followers of Christ, commence their religious course while they are young. God calls them into his kingdom, and appoints them a service to be performed for him. He trains them to become soldiers of the cross ; and it is by patient continuance in well-doing that they become fitted for a crown of glory. If, then, there are comparatively few in middle life, and almost none in old age, who are brought to repentance, how improbable is it that God's Spirit should often operate effectually on a death-bed ; that he, whose time and faculties have all been given to the service of sin, who has wasted the whole

period allotted him to prepare to die, should, after all, acquire that preparation in the act of dying !

Another consideration that illustrates the delusive nature of death-bed repentance is, that it always takes place in circumstances in which there is the strongest possible temptation to self-deception. The prospect which opens before the dying sinner who is unreconciled to God, is appalling beyond the power of conception. It is the loss of all good, real or imaginary, which he may have enjoyed in this world, and an accumulation of all those woes and tortures in the next, which must be the effect of God's wrath against the reprobate. He had, indeed, often heard of all this when he was in health, and heard of it, it may be, with profound unconcern. The reason was that he regarded it as something distant and invisible, and perhaps even flattered himself that it might not be a reality. But now, when he sees that it is all but just before him, that the covering is beginning to be taken off from the world of woe, his spirit recoils with agony, and he exclaims, ' Who can dwell with this devouring fire ? ' Here is alarm, and agitation, and terror, such as can be known only by being felt, and no wonder that in these circumstances the sinner should earnestly desire to find relief ; and the only way in which he can find it, is by gaining some evidence, real or imaginary, that God is reconciled to him. Hence how natural is it, that he should earnestly watch the changes of his own feelings, and try to discover something with which he may connect the hope that the great work of regeneration has passed upon his soul ; something by which he may persuade himself that his destiny is reversed, and that from being a candidate for hell, he has become an heir of heaven ! How natural that in this state of trembling anxiety, he should grasp at the faintest gleam of hope ; and how probable that he will take up the opinion that he is converted, when this is not the case. And let the idea that he has passed the necessary change once get possession of his mind, whether with or without evidence, and the natural effect of it is to fill him with joy : and here is the true reason of all that rapture which is so often exhibited on the death-bed, where there has been no previous exhibition of Christian character. The soul takes up the idea that it has passed into a state of security ; that it has escaped the tremendous doom to which it was exposed ; that it is just on the threshold of immortal glory, and about to join the communion of angels ; and no wonder it should be filled with rapture in these circumstances, should imagine itself the subject of all holy exercises, and should feel prepared to resign itself into the hands of God with triumph. No doubt, this is the true account of many a triumphant death-bed scene ; and that what seems to be the acting of an overcoming faith, is nothing better than a splendid delusion.

Another consideration which renders death-bed repentance of a suspicious character is, that it usually takes place when the mind is enfeebled by disease, and incapable of vigorous exertion.

If there be any work to which the mind is ever called, which requires the vigorous exercise of all its powers, it is the work of repentance. It is essential that the Gospel system, in its leading features, should be understood, and that its truths should be in the mind, as subjects of practical contemplation. And in order that it may be understood, it must have been not merely heard from the pulpit, but made a subject of thought and reflection. It is moreover necessary that it should be applied. The heart must be thoroughly explored by the light which it furnishes, especially the light of God's holy law; that law must be brought to bear upon the conscience; and the sinner, with a proper understanding of the nature and design of Christ's atonement, must rest on that atonement alone, as the meritorious ground of salvation. Who does not perceive that this is a great work;—a work to require the most vigorous exercise of the faculties of the mind, and the affections of the heart. Recollect now the circumstances in which it is supposed to be performed:—the body not improbably is racked with pain; or it may be that the hand of disease has been so long upon it that its energies are nearly gone. And with the weakness of the body the mind necessarily sympathises; it finds it difficult to command its powers, or to concentrate them on any one subject; and not unfrequently, even where it is generally unclouded, there are intervals of delirium in which the powers of moral agency are suspended. I ask now whether this is a state in which it is probable that the great work of repentance will be performed;—or rather is it not precisely the state, in which the individual, from weakness of body and weakness of mind—to say nothing of other causes—will be most likely to mistake in respect to his own sinfulness, or in respect to the terms of acceptance with God, and to receive that as evidence of being renewed, which, in different circumstances, would be regarded as no evidence? Who has not witnessed, or at least known of cases, in which persons on a sick bed have expressed the most comforting views of spiritual things, and if they had died, would have been spoken of as striking instances of triumphant death, who, on recovery, have declared that, at that very time, they were scarcely conscious of what was passing, and that all which they experienced, on a review of it, seemed to have hardly the semblance of reality? It admits not of question that the case has often occurred, in which even the wild reveries of delirium have been mistaken for the exercises of an intelligent and triumphant faith; and that survivors have talked of the wonderful power of Christian principle to sustain the soul, when the mind was completely unstrung, knowing nothing of its own frantic operations.

The last consideration which I shall notice, illustrative of this subject, is founded wholly upon experience ;—it is that, in almost every case in which persons recover, after they have experienced what is supposed to be a death-bed repentance, they return to the world, and to their evil courses, with as keen a relish as ever. I do not say that there are *no* cases, in which persons, who have indulged a hope of spiritual renovation for the first time on the bed of dangerous sickness, and apparently near the gate of eternity, and have afterwards been restored, have persevered in a religious life, and given evidence of a radical change of character—I do not say that there *are* no such cases, but I can say, after the experience of a considerable number of years, that I never knew one. Many a person have I known, who has felt, while on a sick bed, that religion was a momentous concern, and has professedly chosen the service of God, and has expressed a wish to live only that he might glorify Him, and evince to the world the sincerity of his repentance ; but scarcely has his malady left him, before his religion has left him too, and he is just what he was before, except that he has become vastly more hardened. If we should consult the experience of ministers, who have been practically most conversant with this subject, the testimony we should receive would no doubt accord substantially with this statement : if they have known any exceptions to it, they would say that they have been but few ; and that when they occurred, they regarded them as little less than miraculous. If it be so, then, that the repentance of nearly all who expect to die and yet recover, is mere delusion ; on what ground can we conclude that the repentance of those who actually die, is any better ? The only difference is, that in the one case they live to manifest that it is not genuine ; in the other case they die, and it is impossible that they should manifest it. But nothing is more certain than that all analogy leads to the conclusion, that as they have lived the life, so they die the death, of the impenitent sinner.

What a view do the preceding remarks present of the infatuation and blindness produced by sin ! The considerations which illustrate the danger of deferring repentance to a death-bed, are so plain, as to be within the reach of every mind, and they cannot fail to approve themselves to every mind, the moment they are suggested. And yet how many are there, whose fears about an hereafter are kept quiet by the reflection, that they may safely defer the concerns of religion till their closing hour ! Reader, have you ever begun to yield to this delusion ? Rely on it, you are in circumstances of fearful jeopardy. You are leaving a work sufficient for your whole life to be crowded into the few uncertain moments of its close—moments surely of agony, not improbably of distraction. Oh, dismiss the infatuation of sin, and remember that it is not in death, but *in life*, that you are to prepare for eternity.

Let Christians also beware, lest they give their sanction to a death-bed repentance, by expressing their confidence of its genuineness in respect to their own departed friends. If our friends have never embraced religion till they have come to a dying bed, it is impossible, from the nature of the case, that we should know that they have embraced it then ; because, even if they have a principle of piety implanted in their heart, they do not live to make it manifest ; and there are no expressions which may fall from them, however confident or triumphant, but may be the effect of delusion. I say, then, if they are Christians, it is impossible that we should know it ; and if we believe them to have been Christians, the expression of such an opinion can do them no good, because their destiny is fixed irreversibly. But it may do others immense harm, by encouraging in them the belief, that a death-bed repentance will avail to their salvation ; that they may live in the neglect of religion till their last hour, and then go safe to heaven, in virtue of a few serious thoughts, indulged while passing through the dark valley. Let Christians, then, beware how, even by an unguarded word, they encourage any in this delusion. The careless world are ready enough to embrace such errors, without our aid. God forbid that any of them should perish under a fatal deception, imbibed and retained through our instrumentality !

REVIEWS.

SPEECHES ON THE PASSAGE OF THE BILL FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS. *Delivered in the Congress of the United States, April and May 1830.* Boston : Perkins and Marvin. pp. 304.

[Continued from p. 500.]

THE investigation which this subject received in Congress was full and profound, even beyond our hopes. Every part of it was examined with the keenest legal accuracy, and the truth demonstrated with a power of argument utterly irresistible. The right of the Cherokees to the free, sovereign, inalienable possession of their lands, so long as they may please to occupy them, was settled by proofs which can never be evaded. No demonstration in mathematics could be more convincing. No proposition in the whole circle of moral science was ever established by a chain of reasoning more perfect and beautiful in all its parts, more inevitable and overwhelming in its conclusion. Every division of the argument moves onward in unbroken strength ; not a line falters ; not a weak or exposed point in the whole array ; firm, deliberate, im-

penetrable. The subject was examined not only in the light of abstract justice, benevolence, and moral obligation ; it was tested, and that severely, repeatedly, and in every shape, by a reference to the Constitution, to scores of treaties, to the history of the Indians, the history of our country, the usage of the colonies, the practice of all past administrations, the maxims of national law, the views of profound lawyers and statesmen, the intrinsic character of the bill, the practice of Georgia herself, and the views of her own senators. Out of their own mouths the enemies to the rights of the Indians were convicted. Their sophistry was laid bare ; their misrepresentations detected ; the moral deformity of their reasoning made notorious ; light, like noon-day, flashed in on all the concealment, artifice, and intrigue, which have marked their proceedings in this whole business. Not a point, at which they attempted to rally their forces, where they were not disgracefully defeated. Every historical evidence was made to speak the truth ; every false witness turned out of court ; every sophistical argument dissected, exposed, and refuted, in all possible shapes.

The opposers of this iniquitous measure plied their task nobly ; alert on their posts, faithful in duty, prompt and vigorous in their defence of the Indians. Though it was made the grand measure of the ruling party, and they in the minority, so that they knew, even before its decision, that argument might as well have been spoken to the raging sea, as to all hope of influencing the result, yet they would not be driven from the contest. Theirs was the noble side, the cause not only of the Indians, but of all this nation ; and if clear argument and impressive eloquence could have exorcised the demon of party, theirs would have been the victory. They spoke like men convinced of the importance of truth, and earnest for its triumph.

In point of argument, we are inclined to give the preference to the speech of Mr. Sprague ; it is exceedingly close and powerful in its reasoning, nor is it wanting in passages of eloquence. No where else have we seen the sophistry of the supporters of the bill so glaringly exposed. Mr. Everett's is equally distinguished in his part of the subject ; he shows the enormous absurdity of the bill from beginning to end. The speeches we trust will be in every man's hands throughout the country : we will here present a mere skeleton of some of the points which their perusal makes evident.

From the volume before us, and from the whole debate in Congress, it appears, first :

That this measure originated with the State of Georgia ; that the course to be pursued by the present administration was known before the election of the President ; that his proceedings are in direct accordance with the advice of the famous Committee of the Georgia Legislature in 1827 ; that, apart from this bill, the policy adopted by him in his official intercourse, through commissioners

or otherwise, with the Indians, is inhuman, sordid, and disgraceful to the nation. The present Secretary of War directs the agent of government "*to move upon the Cherokees in the line of their own prejudices;*" *not to meet them in general council, for 'the consequence would be, what it has been, a firm refusal to acquiesce;'* but to appeal to the chiefs and influential men, *not together, but apart at their own houses; and to offer them extensive reservations in fee simple, and other rewards!*" The character of these unblushing propositions of bribery, and of other similar suggestions, has been severely exposed, and with full justice to their author, in the speeches of Messrs. Sprague, in the senate, and Storrs, in the house of representatives.

Second; That the President, in virtually abrogating the treaties with the Indian nations, by taking on himself to inform the Cherokees that he had no power to protect them from the operation of the laws of Georgia, has been guilty of violating the Constitution, and acting in a manner most dangerous to the safety of the republic. If he can annul treaties or deny their obligation with one community, he can with another; and by an approach to despotism hitherto unheard of, our relations with all foreign powers are thus left wholly at the mercy of one man.

Third; that the arguments in favor of the bill were derived in great part from the consideration of the rights of discovery, rights of conquest, rights of civilized over uncivilized mind, rights of the king of Great Britain pretended to have been transferred to the States, and other topics of the like nature, which ought not to have been mentioned, except to reprobate them, in any enlightened assembly. Some were attempted to be drawn from one or two treaties, incorrectly quoted and totally misunderstood; misrepresentations, proved to be so, and yet maintained, not only on the floor of Congress, but in print. A great part of the speeches of the abettors of the bill consisted of inaccurate statements, loose and unprincipled declamation, appeals to sectarian prejudices, and blind, unintelligible sophistry, to release the States from all obligations to keep their covenanted engagements. It was reserved for them to broach the singular doctrine, "that because the President has sworn to support the Constitution, he may abrogate any treaty, or repeal any law, which he himself may judge to be inconsistent with that Constitution."

Fourth; That the views of national moral obligation entertained by the supporters of the bill were beyond measure careless and unprincipled; and that their feelings towards the Indians were of such a character as ought in justice to have excluded them from the discussion. They were called "poor devils;" sympathy in their behalf was ridiculed; the utmost indifference manifested in regard to their fate; the most outrageous falsehoods asserted as to their condition.

"But alas! (said Mr. Wilde, of Georgia,) the Indians melt away before the white man, like snow before the sun! Well, sir! would you keep the snow, and lose the sun?"

"It is the order of nature we exclaim against. Jacob will forever obtain the inheritance of Esau. We cannot alter the laws of providence, as we read them in the experience of ages."

Fifth; That Georgia, by the extension of her oppressive laws over the Cherokees, not only declares that they were not before subject to her jurisdiction, but places herself in open, actual rebellion against the statutes of the United States, calling for immediate and vigorous interference on the part of the general government: That the withholding of that interference by the Executive is an act of connivance with such rebellion: That Congress, in the passage of the Indian bill, present to the whole world the astonishing anomaly of an enlightened republic, not only refusing to interfere for the preservation of her laws when grossly violated, but sanctioning that violation by her own solemn act of approval.

Sixth; that Georgia, by the whole course of her practice from the first of her existence, and by solemn treaties between herself and the Cherokees, has always contradicted her present doctrine, and maintained, as strongly as possible, the full sovereignty of that nation: That in 1824, one of her own Senators established the sovereignty of the Cherokees by the most conclusive reasoning, in a deliberate and written opinion, which in the late congressional debate he could not refute, and of which he did not even attempt a refutation: That the compact of 1802, on which Georgia so strangely insists for the support of her tyrannical claims, does, in itself, utterly destroy those claims, even if no previous or successive treaties between the United States and the Indians could be found in existence: And that all the right which Georgia can claim by virtue of any compact with the United States is the right of accession to the property, when the Indian title shall have been legitimately and peaceably extinguished.

Seventh; That "there is not an act of Georgia since Oglethorp first planted his foot upon the site of Savannah; there is not a resolve, ordinance, or law of Congress; there is not a treaty of the United States with the Indian Tribes,—that does not tend to establish the fact, that the Indians are the sovereign proprietors of the lands and hunting grounds they claim. You might have put the question to every man in this nation, or child on the frontier, and he would have told you so, until the legislation of the States, aided by interest, instructed him otherwise." The passage of this bill goes to "stultify the senate of the United States for a period of thirty-seven years;" fill the national statute book with nonsense; and make the history of our country's legislation nothing but a series of monstrous absurdities.

Eighth; That the policy of the present administration is not only contrary to the constitution and to every principle of benevolence,

but at war with that of every preceding administration, and with the course pursued by the patriots of the revolution, and recommended and practised by the Father of his Country. For several years, the methods adopted in obtaining cessions of territory from the Indian Tribes have been practically coercive, and not in accordance with the spirit of humanity. But this has been owing to the conduct of the treaty commissioners, and the nature of their representations and arguments; nor has it ever originated in the measures of government, which have heretofore been strictly upright and constitutional. Until the present administration, it has been unheard of that a course of injustice and intrigue should be prescribed and marked out by the Executive for the commissioners and agents of government. But now, our negotiations with them are nothing better than a system of cheating, bribery, and corruption. It is *recommended* to cajole them out of their territory; to seduce them into unfavorable treaties; to persuade, threaten, and compel them to relinquish portion after portion of their country. The fatal parchments have been signed in tears; and if an individual is prominent in his opposition, he is "*broken on the spot*," and the action is daringly avowed. It is recommended to send an "*armed force*" to the Cherokee country, to assist in *persuading* the natives to remove; and the enforcement of the State laws, under whose operation the President declares that the Indians cannot live, is made use of to produce such a *persuasion*.

Ninth; That of all propositions of government, all schemes of legislation, this Bill is the most perfectly Utopian, contradictory and absurd. Of all projects that ever entered into the head of any political fanatic, it is the wildest and most visionary; the most utterly destitute of any foundation whatever in necessity, utility, or common sense. There is but one feature which can have operated to redeem it from universal contempt; and that is, the enormous scale of its absurdity. Vast acts of oppression astonish the mind, when insignificant ones would only excite its scorn. If a man kills an individual, he is a murderer; when he destroys ten thousand, he becomes a hero. There is something in the extravagance of this plan so gigantic, that the mind is overwhelmed by the conception; we are confounded with the vastness of the folly. It is like the wild combinations that present themselves to the frenzied imagination of the maniac, rather than the drivellings of idiocy. It involves such a complication of incoherencies as no common mind could have invented.

"Whoever heard of such a thing before?" said Mr. Everett. "Whoever read of such a project? Ten or fifteen thousand families to be rooted up, and carried hundreds, aye, a thousand of miles into the wilderness! There is not such a thing on the annals of mankind. It was the practice—the barbarous and truly savage practice—of the polished nations of antiquity to bring home a part of the population of conquered countries as slaves. It was a cruel exercise of the rights of the conqueror, as then understood, and in turn practised by all nations. But in time of peace, towards unoffending communities, subject to

our sovereignty indeed, but possessing rights guaranteed to them by more than one hundred treaties, to remove them against their will, by thousands, to a distant and a different country, where they must lead a new life, and form other habits, and encounter the perils and hardships of a wilderness: sir, I never heard of such a thing; it is an experiment on human life and human happiness of perilous novelty."

Tenth; That it proposes and requires an incalculably wasteful expenditure of the public money. Five hundred thousand dollars have already gone from the treasury—it is vain to ask where; twenty-four millions more will be demanded, ere this bill can go into complete execution! A sum almost sufficient to disburse the whole national debt; sufficient, if expended in internal improvements or public charities, to render this country the pride and the wonder of the whole world. This calculation is neither visionary, nor improbable, nor false; it is based on indisputable evidence: it is arrived at by a minute statement of items, in a close, accurate, business-like "counting of the cost." It is made up,—from the *original purchase money*, more than seven millions of dollars; from the expense in the payment for *improvements*, more than nine millions; from the *cost of collection and transportation*, more than two millions; from the expense of *subsistence for one year* of 75,000 human beings, more than four millions,—“to say nothing of the support, which the Government, unless it leaves them to starve, will indubitably be compelled to furnish them, at the end of the year, and for years to come;” for the *extinguishment of titles* beyond the Arkansas, a million and a half; for the support of the territorial government and a Military Establishment, nearly a million. Twenty-four millions!! And this is the consequence of the speculations of an administration, whose grand title to the public esteem was to be—its practices of *economical reform*. Twenty-four millions from the treasury of a republic so prudent that the whole expenses of the national establishment could be furnished from the trappings of a monarchy! Our republic may be termed ‘*the miser turned spendthrift*,’ when her representatives, who have been for years haggling and huckstering to reduce or annihilate the hard-earned pensions of her revolutionary patriots, shall scatter twenty-four millions from her treasury, in the prosecution of one of the wildest schemes of inhumanity ever suggested.

Eleventh; That it leaves the disbursement of this enormous expenditure, without the least specification, within the uncontrolled discretion of one department, at the mercy of one man. “Five hundred thousand pounds,” said Edmund Burke, animadverting on the appropriations for unspecified civil list expenses, “five hundred thousand pounds is a serious sum. But it is nothing to the prolific principle upon which the sum was voted: a principle that may well be called, *the fruitful mother of an hundred more*. Neither is the damage to public credit of any great consequence, *when compared to that which results to public morals, and to the safety of the con-*

stitution, from the exhaustless mine of corruption opened by the precedent, and to be wrought by the principle." The principles of this great Statesman are peculiarly applicable here: for the expenditure of this money must of necessity occasion a scene of corruption in the herd of public officers, and of degradation in the public morals, beyond all example.

"Here we have a vast operation," we again quote from Mr. Everett's able speech, "extending to tribes and nations, to tens of thousands of souls, purchasing and exchanging whole regions, building fifteen thousand habitations in a distant wilderness, and putting seventy-five thousand individuals in motion across the country, and not an officer or agent specified; not a salary named; not one item of expenditure limited; the whole put into the pocket of one Head of Department, to be scattered at his will!"

Twelfth; That the execution of this proposed measure would be attended, not only with a vast expenditure and loss to the United States, but in regard to the Indians, with an amount of misery utterly incalculable, and to be terminated only in their total extinction. The heart sickens at a bare attempt to conceive or delineate the scenes which must ensue.

"A community of civilized people, of all ages, sexes, and conditions of bodily health are to be dragged hundreds of miles, over mountains, rivers and deserts, where there are no roads, no bridges, no habitations; and this is to be done for eight dollars a head, and done by contract. The question is to be, What is the least for which you will take so many hundred families, averaging so many infirm old men, so many little children, so many lame, feeble, and sick? What will you contract for?"—"I will not," said Mr. Everett, "vote a dollar for this dreadful contract. Send these Indians off by contract, and their removal will present a scene of suffering, unequalled by that of a flying army before a triumphant foe."

The agitation, the terror, the tumult, the misery of such a march to the dead waste beyond the Arkansas cannot be described; it is a consequence of this measure, which most persons do not seem to have thought of.

But the sufferings of the march are nothing to the misery in store at its end. The curse of perpetual desolation rests upon the greater portion of country to which they are to be driven. There, hardly a flower grows, or a brook runs, or a tree strikes its roots into the soil, or lifts its branches to the sun-light. A great part of the region is nothing but untamed and indomitable barrenness; the rain, and the sun, and the soft dews of heaven, and the processes of human culture, would be alike wasted on a marble marl or a naked sand-desert, which nature resolved should never be reclaimed from its sterility. The herds of bisons that sweep over the dreary scene for leagues, scarcely touching a blade of green grass or even a tuft of moss with the hoof, supply, by their ordure, the only fuel with which the wandering hunter can light up his fire. Man can live, where the wild beast would perish with famine; but in part of this country, human existence, with all human ingenuity, cannot be sustained. The most powerful tribes, in its rich-

est tracts, and the nearest our own border, "during several seasons in each year," are in a state of starvation. "*The living child is often buried with the dead mother, because no one can spare it so much food as would sustain it through its helpless infancy*"! After so shocking a recital, no other feature can be added. Yet to this region, where the hardiest savages die through hunger, and in which there is not room, even for the babe that is born there, we propose to send seventy-five thousand new inhabitants, accustomed hitherto to the plenty, and many of them to the luxuries of civilized life!

Think of the change to the Cherokees, from the exuberant fertility of their pleasant native lands, from their ripe orchards and cultivated cotton fields and gardens and farms, to such a scene of incurable and inevitable dearth!

Nor, in the *moral* world, could anything of vigor and beauty spring up; amidst such a region, and in the endurance of such privations, every good habit, every good feeling must soon die. "It is in vain," says the official report, "to talk to people in this condition about learning and religion." And this is the truth; a school of morality might almost as well be established in the prison of despair, as amidst these troops of starving barbarians. But the subject is too painful. It is too painful to think that a Christian nation should conceive such a project;—to break up and disorganize the government, the schools, the churches, of a whole civilized people: expatriate thousands of families from a delicious climate, a generous soil, a Christian neighborhood, from the mounds that cover the bones of their fathers, from everything, known, loved, and valued, many miles beyond the extremest outposts of advancing civilization, to be set down on a spot utterly barren in itself, and surrounded by famishing savages who live in perpetual war! In such a situation, even with all their present institutions in vigor, they must soon be exterminated, or relapse into barbarism. But with passions excited, and habitudes and institutions broken up and commingled in the confusion of removal, social and Christian discipline would disappear; nor could religion, or knowledge, or domestic manners ever regain their power. Multiply instructors and missionaries indefinitely, and set up the proposed territorial government, and draw a cordon of troops round every ferocious tribe, and still the obstacles would be utterly insurmountable. Yet all this vast and dreadful operation of removal is to be undertaken, that the Indians may have scope and leisure for uninterrupted improvement!

An imagination which could paint the desolation of the Carnatic, and the horrors of the French Revolution, might undertake to grapple with a detail of the frightful consequences attendant on this measure. It is beyond our power to give a faithful picture of a single one of them. The exterminating hostilities of the Indian tribes beyond Arkansas have been partially described by one of

the strongest partizans of this bill. He says that through the whole of that vast region, there is not a tribe that has not an hereditary enemy to flee from or pursue. Those uninhabitable wilds, that are scarce disturbed the year long by the footstep of other living thing, echo the warwhoop and shake with the tramp of conflicting savages. As if it were not misery enough to endure, season after season, the horrors of famine, they make each other's destruction the principal business of life. But they have room enough to fight with their native caution, and to exercise all their ingenuity of stratagem in the onset and escape : they have unoccupied deserts to sweep over in each others pursuit. Now, however, we propose to narrow their battle grounds, to compress them together, and to place new tribes, to the amount of seventy-five thousand individuals, in their midst. It reminds us of the amphitheatrical exhibitions in Imperial Rome ; where, for the sport of the people, naked slaves were cast in upon the arena, and the doors of the dens of wild beasts of all descriptions, thrown wide open upon them.

The progress of this bill teems with warning to the United States. It tells, with a power which no eloquence could have commanded, the awful necessity of an enlightened and well-principled public mind, for the perpetuity of our institutions. In all countries, where despotism has not stamped the soul of the subject with imbecility, popular vigilance must be the only safeguard to the public freedom. Just in proportion as the people become unwary, indifferent, or uninformed, civil liberty will be broken down, and disorders rush in and accumulate on every part of the Constitution. In our Republic, where predicaments may occur and questions arise every month, which, without a clear, informed, and regulated mind in the whole country, and a very delicate management on the part of those to whom they are entrusted for decision, may shake the union to its centre, popular ignorance and apathy will be freedom's grave. The tendency of the Executive to an unwarrantable extent of its prerogative should keep us on the watch, and cautious in the extreme, how we commit the highest trusts in the Republic to unprincipled hands.

A deep religious spirit, and a morality founded on this ; a universal, and growing acquaintance with the principles and operation of the Constitution ; a guardianship, like that of the lioness to her whelps, over every particle of the rights of the poorest and most defenceless communities within our limits ; a suspicious eye to the conduct of every individual in public authority ; a restive, intractable opposition to everything that looks like despotism, or that attempts to shroud the measures of government in mystery ; a disposition "to judge of the pressure of a grievance by the badness of the principle ;" and to crown all, a steadfast regard to the sacredness of the national faith ;—these should be our features as a people. As Burke said of us, while yet dependent on Great

Britain, we should "augur misgovernment at a distance, and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze." These were our characteristics as colonies; these were the traits of our youthful independence.

Under the administration of Washington, the people were more watchful of governmental movements, and better acquainted with the Constitution, than they are now, when knowledge and vigilance are more deeply necessary. The Constitution had then been just formed; every paragraph was familiarly known; it was an experiment which they resolved should be fairly tested. The essays of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, were widely circulated; the whole country was alert; no act in the slightest degree unconstitutional could have imposed upon the people. Now, we are sluggish, incautious, confident in the success of our republic, and easy as to the operations of government. Amidst the dissemination of all other knowledge, the study of the Constitution has diminished; in regard to most public measures, the mass of the community are absolutely ignorant what is their character in the light of republican principles, what their immediate influence, or what their future consequences. Sophistry blinds them, and they become persuaded, in very important instances, that inhuman and unconstitutional measures are right.

No question like this, touching the rights of a large portion of the community, ought ever to enter Congress, till it has undergone a thorough consideration in the public mind. Then, should occasion require, the people will be ready to interpose, and with a prompt, decided, energetic authority. They will not need to be urged into remonstrance against a meditated act of injustice; it will be their simultaneous movement, from Maine to the Texas. No government, in the slightest degree considerate, would dare, by any illegal step, to encounter the energy of such an enlightened public opinion. But if the people sleep, a dangerous measure may be passed, and its consequences irretrievable, before they can be brought to a solemn consideration of the subject. To guard effectually against such a state of things, the only sure provision is a correct moral sentiment, combined with a universal knowledge of the Constitution.

The Indian question has been suffered to take us by surprise, and to find us, as a community, unacquainted with its merits. The sophistry of the enemies to Indian rights seemed to blind for a time the whole public mind, and distort the moral sense of the country. The bill in Congress was suffered to be carried as a party measure. The efforts made by the friends of humanity to wake the country into seasonable action, fell clogged by the ignorance and perversion of feeling so generally prevalent. Memorials were neither sufficiently quick nor numerous to exert a powerful interposition. Many believed and argued there was a fatality in this

whole business ; that it was a fiat in God's providence that the Indians must die ; and that all we could do to resist it would be in vain. Such a belief was scarcely accompanied with pity ; the thing was talked of with as much indifference as if the Indian tribes were but a great herd of buffaloes. Few individuals in the country had any knowledge whatever of the actual condition of the Cherokees ; all the Indians were looked upon as savages ; and a man hazarded the charge of enthusiasm if he was warm in their defence, or came up, in any degree as he ought, to the performance of duty. People were really ashamed to memorialize ; they shrunk from cold looks and sneers, if urged to engage with ardor in the task of procuring petitioners. Christians were afraid of the cry of church and state ; others were fearful of meddling with what did not concern them ; others declared that such an excitement at the north would only prejudice the cause, and all, being ignorant of the character and rights of the Indians and of the true merits of the case, and of course having no stable principles to guide them, entered on the measures in their favor with reluctance, and even then half repented of the little they had done. There was this evil also, that most of those who signed memorials did it *without expecting success* ; they did it with a sort of melancholy, hopeless resignation, accompanied with many doubts in regard to the necessity of the measure, that "cast ominous conjecture," or in the more expressive conventional phrase, "threw cold water," on the whole thing. "I will sign, but I don't think it will be the least use to memorialize," was the common strain of remark. Nothing good, or to any purpose, will ever be done in such a state of feeling. On the part of Christians, there was a sad want of firmness and moral courage. "What will the political world say of us ? Shall we not be derided ?" Or if these were not the questions, conscience was so little enlightened, that it did not tell them the great duty of humanity incumbent on them to discharge. There was likewise a general disposition to act too exclusively as individuals ; a dread of exciting odium and sarcasm by combining in this benevolent cause ; an unwillingness to acknowledge the responsibility of making our neighbors act and feel right, as well as of doing right ourselves. We might be ready to sign in our own persons, but were unwilling to use self-denial, or make sacrifices, for the purpose of obtaining additional signatures. But did we do right, if we merely recorded our own solitary protest, and refused to carry the paper to others, or to persuade those within our influence ? The great law of Christian love enforces its claims upon us collectively as well as individually ; to a certain extent we are responsible for the belief and practice of all with whom we associate. If the friends of the Indians had exerted themselves as they ought, there would have been five thousand signatures where there were five hundred ; and the memorials, as have often been the fact in

Great Britain, would have literally covered the tables of Congress; accomplishing, as their result, a triumphant vote in behalf of suffering humanity. But our habit of regarding the Indians as a degraded race, destined for extinction, our indifference as to their fate, and the obstinate disbelief of their advancement in civilization, in addition to the prevailing want of acquaintance with our country's Constitution, treaties and history, prepared us to receive the scheme of the President with no very sensitive marks of displeasure, and to witness the despotic course in the proposed expulsion of the Indians with an apathy most criminal and alarming. Because the oppression did not enter our doors, we ceased to regard it as unjust.

The duty of *memorializing* in this country is not understood. The people are unacquainted with their own best interests, too confident in the wisdom and patriotism of government, and so selfish as to be politically blind. The English are better acquainted with this duty, and more ready for its performance. The form of our government is so much more favorable to freedom than theirs, that we seem to think the Constitution will preserve our liberties, instead of remembering that nothing but our utmost vigilance can preserve the Constitution. In the year 1791, when exertions were vigorous for the abolition of the slave trade, "there was not a day for three months, Sundays excepted, in which five or six petitions to parliament were not resolved upon in some places or other in the kingdom." In that year, five hundred and nineteen were presented for the total abolition. If we are not mistaken, Mr. Clarkson himself, in the space of four weeks, obtained seventy thousand signatures. Who here could have gained such a result for the Sabbath, or the Indians? Those who know anything about English history, remember what multitudes of petitions and memorials poured in upon the House of Commons about the period of our Revolution; some, among the most forcible, written by Mr. Burke and Sir George Saville, who were not thought to be out of their station in this employment. But here, active petitioners for objects of benevolence are styled meddling enthusiasts; and one would really think, from the tone which many have not been ashamed to use, that we are out of our place when attempting to influence the measures of our own Representatives, by the expression of our own wishes. It will be a new thing indeed when the people of this republic are interdicted from an interference in the proceedings of government by the expression of their views, whenever and in whatever manner they please. The manner in which an excitement for objects of public benevolence is said to be "got up," is also exclaimed against with great fury. On the floor of Congress last winter, severe strictures were urged in regard to the circulars in behalf of the Indians; as if benevolent men in this country have not a right to use all the consti-

tutional measures in their power to promote their objects. The outcry is precisely similar to that raised in England, where, on the eve of our Revolution, meetings became frequent and full for the redress of our grievances, and spirited circulars were issued throughout the colonies. We are indeed degraded, if we will be kept back from our privilege and duty of petitioning, by the clamors or sneers, either public or private, which in a good cause we ought to be forward to encounter.

An unwillingness to memorialize, when the business is not too inconsiderable to be noticed, ought never to be felt or manifested in the Republic. Yet every one knows the apathy which has existed, and the extreme difficulty with which anything like a general expression of the public feeling can be obtained. There is also a disposition to relax, after the first effort; an unwillingness to return to the trial; an idea that the movements are useless, which do not at once accomplish their purpose. We will not keep our sinews girded to renew the struggle year after year; as if the subject were not worthy of perseverance, a second attempt can hardly be procured; as if intimidated by ill success, or ashamed of our first ardor, we give up the purpose, creep off in silence, and the cause dies away.

Yet in other respects, we are acknowledged to be enterprising. We have as much industry and steadfastness of purpose as the English. Surely the cause of public morality does not demand less zeal, than the accumulation of public or private wealth. It is not less important to maintain the sanctity of one day in the week, than it is to hoard up riches during the other six. It is not less necessary to keep the public faith and preserve a whole Indian community from annihilation, than it is to dig canals, to build light-houses, or to vex the sea with our fisheries. Had the patriots of Great Britain, when they set their shoulders to the abolition of the Slave Trade, been so fickle-minded, so half-persuaded, so backward in their efforts, that great work of benevolence had still remained unaccomplished.

This important topic forces another on the mind;—the criminal neglect of the Indians and their interests, as an object demanding the prayers of Christians. We might speak of this neglect as extending to all the civil interests of the land. If a stranger from another sphere should light upon this globe and enter our churches, he would be apt to imagine that in this part of the universe God has the arrangement only of our religious prosperity, and leaves the political and civil affairs of the country to take care of themselves; or, what would amount to the same, gives us in this department the exclusive jurisdiction. In episcopal churches, the Liturgy has provided supplications for the weal of the realm; a very happy foresight, considering the tendency of all Christian communities to practical political atheism.

Especially is it necessary to humble ourselves in prayer to God, when the nation is on the very brink of a crime, which all might justly fear would bring down some speedy and terrible infliction of the vengeance of Heaven. If men of piety do not feel for the Indians, if Christians desert them at the throne of grace, then may they indeed weep in despair. The truest patriots have ever maintained the deepest sense of dependence upon God. Would Christians now do this in regard to the fate of the Indians, their own feelings would be kept alive, their minds clear, and they would be ready to act with energy. We should no longer see them enter coldly and reluctantly into this subject; they would put to it a strong hand; and in the very striking scriptural expression, *come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty*.

The prayers of 'the solitary saint' should always go up for the oppressed; and if ever any human beings needed them, the Indians do now. Defenceless, abandoned, submissive, with what solemnity and pathos do they speak to the people of the United States. Their patience is indeed wonderful. God grant them an unailing supply of this virtue.

In whatever light we view this bill, it is portentous in its aspect, and pregnant with ruin. But there is one part of its consequences, that should make the Christian deprecate its curse as he would the pestilence; which should add intensity to his prayers that God might utterly avert it. It is the blight with which it would wither the hopes, now so teeming with promise, of the full evangelization of these interesting remnants of the Aborigines. In vain, if we break up their schools, and scatter their churches, and drive them out amidst the wilds and savages beyond the Arkansas, may we hope ever to rebuild the desolations of this rising Zion. Already, the influence of the distractions caused by this bill is felt in the decay of religious anxiety, and we might almost fear, in the departure of God's Spirit. What can be expected, in the very nature of things, from a tumultuous removal to the pathless wilds beyond the Mississippi, even could they exist there a few years, surrounded by murderous hordes, but a rapid retrograde march in civilization, and a relapse, as to all piety, into worse than the savageness of past centuries. If we uproot them now, we uproot at the same time every plant of morality and piety which the dews of heaven have cherished, and render it impossible, to all human appearance, ever again to behold their fruits. It is perfectly vain to imagine, that if we start them off towards the Pacific, a single one of their improvements would ever arrive with them to abide at their destination. Hopeless, miserable, abandoned, what heart could they have to put themselves again to the work of building up the institutions, which a Christian people had laid waste, and which, if again erected, would in all probability be ere long overwhelmed again, and swept down, by the rushing tide of a republi-

can population. What heart, if we cast them out from their own native Eden, could they have to nourish in a strange soil the plants, so long to grow, so hard to cultivate, but of which,—“their early visitation and their last,”—they had already experienced and loved the value.

We appeal to the Christian public, and ask if they can suffer, that, through the rapacity of one State, and the connivance of our Executive, not only our national faith shall be made a byword of contempt, but the rights of a whole people annihilated, and all that is flourishing in their institutions hopelessly destroyed? If it be so, they had better be at the mercy of the Turks, and have the whirlwind of war sweep over them, as it did over Scio. They would have the consolation to reflect, that nothing better could have been expected from infidels and slaves. But to be thus treated by Christians and freemen—the possibility makes us thought-sick. May it never be said of our country, that when the blessings of Christianity had dropped upon an Indian people, and the light of civilization was already illuminating every cabin, we rose up to extinguish it, and drove them out to chase the buffalo and echo the war whoop, to ‘curse God and die,’—in the wilderness.

There is no American but must tremble for his country, who looks back with a reflecting mind on the indications presented by public events in the past and passing year. That the demon of party should have gained such possession of the souls of our Senators and Representatives, as to permit them, in the eyes of all the world, to set their hand and seal to the violation of the Faith of the Republic, plighted in multiplied and most solemn treaties, and lend their aid to carry forward a measure, which, if executed to the full intention, must annihilate the rights of seventy-five thousand freemen, and plunge them into irretrievable misery, is indeed a most dark and dreadful fact. It speaks volumes of danger to our free institutions. The danger remains : but that measure, we trust in God, will yet be stayed. There is a court of judicature, a light amidst all the storms that may threaten to wreck our liberties, aloof almost from the possibility of prejudice, and elevated above the commotions of party zeal. Before that tribunal, this great question is soon to be brought. Let the people of the United States prepare themselves firmly to support its decisions, and the rights of the Indians may yet be secured. But there may be delay ; and if there should be, then must these unfortunate people remain, exposed to the galling oppression of the laws of Georgia, without the possibility of a redress of their grievances. It is well remarked by Mr. Wirt, that every officer of Georgia, who attempts to serve a civil process within the Indian territory, stands amenable for violating the laws of the United States. But the laws are a dead letter without an Executive ; with an unprincipled one, they are instruments of oppression. We need not disguise from our readers, what they cannot disguise from themselves—that so long as

our present Executive maintains the opinions and the line of conduct he has adopted, there is no hope for the Indians but in the virtue of the people at large, to whom they have appealed. From the people, therefore, enlightened and determined that they will not suffer the stain of such cruelty, but that full justice shall yet be executed, a redeeming influence must enter, and be all-powerful, in the Congress of the coming winter. The Indians *must* be protected; *the laws must be executed*: if there be not virtue enough in the people to make their National Legislature see that this is done, then we are lost indeed.

THE HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF DISSENTING CHURCHES, AND MEETING HOUSES, IN LONDON, WESTMINSTER, AND SOUTHWARK, *including the Lives of their Ministers, from the Rise of Nonconformity to the Present Time. With an Appendix, on the Origin, Progress, and Present State of Christianity in Britain.* In four volumes. By Walter Wilson, of the Inner Temple, London, 1808.

IN this rare and interesting work, we have accounts, more or less extended, of hundreds of Dissenting Ministers, who have lived, or are now living, in and around London. The history runs back to the origin of dissent, soon after the Reformation in England. The author treats his subject under six divisions, the Eastern, Southern, Northern, and Western in the city of London; and Westminster, and Southwark. His plan is, after giving the name and situation of a particular place of worship, and briefly describing the changes it has undergone, to publish a list of its ministers, followed by a biographical notice of each. Many of these biographies are full and interesting, and constitute the only remaining record of men, eminent and useful in their generation, who have long since entered on their final reward.

Our principal object in noticing these volumes is, to avail ourselves of the testimony they furnish as to the effects of Unitarian ministrations in England. In our second volume, p. 669, we published long extracts from Bogue and Bennett's *History of Dissenters*, on the same subject. The testimony of Wilson is entitled to the more consideration, as he is a layman, and moreover distinguished for his moderation and candor. We shall make our quotations in the order in which they occur in the volumes.

Speaking of the Presbyterian establishment in Jewry Lane, the same to which Lardner, Benson, and Price ministered, Mr. W. says,

"The first Pastor was Mr. Timothy Cruso, who settled there a little before the Revolution. In his time, there was a *flourishing church and congregation*." After his death, the church was diminished on account of a division in the choice of a successor. "In the time of Dr. Lardner and Dr. Benson, it was in a *very low state*; for though they were men of learning and talents, and deserve honorable mention on account of their labors in defending Christianity against infidels, yet *their sentiments and mode of preaching were extremely unpopular, and but ill adapted to preserve the church from a languishing state*. After some feeble attempts to revive the expiring interest, the society dissolved in the year 1774, and the meeting house was disposed of to the Methodists." vol. i. p. 55.

The Presbyterian Society in New Broad Street, was collected soon after Bartholomew day, by the Rev. Thomas Vincent. Several of his successors, as Dr. Daniel Williams and Dr. John Evans, were ministers of eminence and usefulness.

"The congregation at the old meeting was *very large and substantial*, and continued so for some years after their removal to the new place; but *for the last thirty or forty years, it gradually declined*. At length, upon the expiration of the lease, about the year 1780, it was reduced to so low a state that a renewal became unadvisable, and *the church dissolved*. In point of doctrinal sentiment, the ministers of this society have deviated not very materially from the Harmony of Confessions of the Reformed Churches, *with the exception of Mr. John Palmer, the last minister, [settled in 1755,] who was reckoned a Socinian*." vol. ii. p. 190.

Pinner's Hall was, for more than a century, one of the most celebrated places of worship among the Dissenters. The congregation to which it belonged was collected in the reign of Charles the Second, by the Rev. Anthony Palmer. He was assisted by a Mr. Fownes, and succeeded by the Rev. Richard Wavel. All these ministers were zealous Calvinists.

"Their successors, though divines of considerable eminence in their day, *were of a very different stamp, and preached in a manner to empty pews*. It is a most surprising circumstance, how a number of Christians, and many of them of long experience, should, from a warm, evangelical Pastor, fix upon one who, however learned and amiable, strove to keep his people in the dark, as to his sentiments concerning the leading doctrines of the Gospel. But Pinner's Hall affords not the only melancholy instance of this nature. The lease of the meeting house expiring in 1778, the church, after subsisting more than a century, *became extinct*." vol. iii. p. 254.

The Presbyterian meeting house in Monkswell Street, is probably the oldest now in existence among the Dissenters in London. It was erected, soon after the great fire, in 1666, for the famous

Mr. Thomas Doolittle, by whose labors the congregation was gathered. The society was very numerous at the time of his death, and continued to flourish under his immediate successors, who were men of strictly evangelical sentiments.

“But latterly, several circumstances have operated to the decline of this congregation. At present, the number of pews greatly exceeds that of the hearers, who are so few, that the ends of public worship seem scarcely answered by their meeting together. With the falling off of the congregation, there has been an equal declension from the doctrines taught by the earlier Pastors of this society. For many years past, those doctrines, that are peculiarly styled evangelical, have ceased to resound from their pulpit, and given place to what is called a more rational mode of preaching.” vol. iii. p. 188.

The Presbyterian congregation, which assembled at the meeting house in Bartholomew Close, was gathered near the end of the reign of Charles the Second, by Mr. John Quick. The church continued to worship here, under a succession of ministers, till the year 1753, when, in consequence of its reduced state, it was dissolved.

“This congregation was never large, nor indeed would the size of the meeting house admit of it. But latterly it declined very fast, by deaths and desertions, nor did others appear to take their places. In the times of the latter ministers, *there was an equal declension from the doctrines of the reformation.* The earlier ministers were decided Calvinists; Dr. Fleming [the last] it is well known, was a *zealous Socinian.*” vol. iii. p. 371.

In the early stages of nonconformity, the society in Princes-Street, Westminster, was one of the most flourishing among the English Presbyterians. Few congregations can boast such a succession of learned, exemplary ministers;—an Alsop, a Shower, a Mayo, a Calamy, men who were instrumental in building up the great cause of Christianity, as well as of Protestant dissent.

“Prior to Dr. Kippis, the ministers of this society were Trinitarians, and may be considered moderate Calvinists; at present the church ranks with what are called the *Heterodox Dissenters.* Since the death of Dr. Kippis, the people, who are but few in number, have been in rather an unsettled state with regard to a pastor, none having continued with them for any length of time. Indeed, the purposes of religious worship seem scarcely answered in keeping open the doors to *so few persons; nor can it be very encouraging to a minister to preach to empty benches.* Notwithstanding the pains that are taken by some zealous persons to uphold the cause of what is, by a perverseness of language, called “Unitarianism,” their success is by no means apparent in our old Presbyterian churches, which *seem fast hastening to a dissolution.*”

The meeting house in Maid Lane, Southwark, was erected about the year 1672, for Mr. Thomas Wadsworth, who gathered a church here, soon after the passing of the Bartholomew Act.

“It (the church) subsisted at this place, for nearly the period of a century, under a succession of ministers, many of whom for talents and respectability, ranked high amongst the churches of their day. In its earlier days, the congregation was large and respectable, and the meeting house well filled; but under the ministry of Mr. Ward it declined so rapidly, that its dissolution became easy and natural, and took place about the year 1752. With regard to religious sentiment, there does not appear to have been any great difference before the settlement of Mr. Ward, *who was then an Arian, and afterwards became a Socinian*. The former ministers appear to have been zealously attached to the old Protestant doctrines, counting it their honor to set forth Jesus Christ and him crucified, as the sum and substance of their discourses.”

The Presbyterian congregation at St. Thomas', Southwark, was collected in the reign of the second Charles, by Mr. Nathaniel Vincent, brother to Thomas Vincent, who wrote an account of the plague.

“Mr. Vincent left a large congregation at the time of his death; and it continued in a respectable state for more than half a century under his successors. Since that time, it has gradually declined; and for some years past, *the number of people has been so few, that the purposes of public worship seem scarcely answered by keeping the doors open*. One of the services on the Lord's day has consequently been dropped. There has been a very considerable variation at different periods in the religious sentiments of this society. The earlier ministers were zealously attached to the old Protestant doctrines, and God remarkably owned their labors for the enlargement of the church: But for the last half century and upwards, *both ministers and people have been gradually receding from their doctrines, and the effect has been, that one of the largest places of worship amongst the Dissenters in the metropolis, has become nearly deserted*.” “The remnant of the congregation have thrown off the antiquated term, *meeting house*, and substituted that of *Unitarian chapel*.” vol. iv. p. 295.

Presbyterian Society, King John's Court, Southwark.

“This society was for many years in a very flourishing state; but in proportion as the old Protestant doctrines were departed from, and another gospel introduced, different from that which their earlier ministers gloried in, *the congregation declined*. The five first ministers were decided Calvinists; those that succeeded were far gone in Arianism.”

Presbyterian Society, Jamaica Row, Rotherhithe.

"This congregation was for many years large and respectable, but for the last forty years of its existence gradually declined, *till there were scarcely any hearers left*. This induced the last pastor, Dr. Flexman, to resign, which he did in 1783, and the congregation dissolved. There was a considerable variation in religious sentiment between the former and latter ministers. Mr. Ratcliffe was supposed to be in the middle way, that is a Baxterian. Those that preceded him were Calvinists, and *his successors Arians*. The congregation of Independents that now occupies the place, was raised, after the dissolution of Dr. Flexman's church, and invited Mr. John Townsend to the pastoral office. He is the present minister, and has a flourishing congregation."

Independent Society, Lower Rotherhithe.

"When Mr. Sandercock (a Unitarian) settled at Rotherhithe, his congregation was but small, nor did his preaching or religious opinions tend in any degree to increase it. On the contrary, it continued to decline under his hands for several years, till their numbers were so far reduced that they broke up their church state about 1762. After this, Mr. Sandercock retired to York, where he occasionally assisted Mr. Newcome Cappe."

Presbyterian Society in Leather Lane.

"The Presbyterian Society in Leather Lane was collected in the reign of Charles second, by Mr. John Turner." "Mr. Turner had various ministers to assist him, and left at his death a flourishing congregation. His meeting house was a moderate size building, with three galleries; and in former times it was frequented by many people of substance. During the latter time of Mr. Pope's ministry, the congregation very much declined; and after Mr. Hughes left them, about 1801, they had one settled pastor. The doors, however, were kept open till 1812, when the meeting house was disposed of to a more thriving congregation of Methodists." "By far the majority of ministers were decidedly attached to the old Protestant doctrines; nor does there appear to have been any essential deviation till after the death of Mr. Pope. *The two last pastors were Arians.*"

Appended to these volumes is a treatise "on the origin, progress, and present state of Christianity in Britain." In the last chapter, "On the present state of the Dissenting Interest," the author expresses his views more at large respecting the causes of decline in some of the congregations.

"That which contributed most to the decline of the Dissenting interest, was the open departure of many from the doctrines of the Gospel. This began to take place immediately after the Salter's-Hall controversy, and continued to make rapid strides amongst the

Presbyterians, till it has at length landed them in a region something below Socinianism." "The Presbyterians have continued to decline in a very progressive manner, till their congregations have been ruined, and their meeting houses shut up. The progress of error was gradual. It first began with that convenient stalking horse, *charity*, which was as successfully applied to screen those who departed from the doctrines of the Gospel, as it is in the present day to cover a defection from the distinguishing features of nonconformity. As liberality grew in fashion, the divines of the new school began to preach up the innocency of mental error; and the celebrated lines of Pope were appealed to with as much confidence as any one would quote a text of Scripture to support a doctrine.

"From High-Arianism, there was a gradual advance, step by step, to the lowest state of Socinianism; and in our own day, the system has been still farther purified, and rendered less objectionable to unbelievers. Under the specious pretence of rescuing Christianity from the corrupt glosses of Christians, the most bare-faced attacks have been made upon everything that is peculiar to the system. If Woolston explained away the miracles of our Lord, in order to render Christianity rational, its modern defenders have been equally unmerciful with his doctrines; and to prepare the way, one of them has had the shameful hardihood to compare the conception of Mary, with the debaucheries of a Roman knight in the temple of Isis. The result of a departure from the doctrines of the Gospel, has been the declension of the Presbyterian interest, and in many places its total extinction. Indeed the name is now retained only by a few Arian congregations, which scarcely exist, and are hastening to a dissolution.

"When the Presbyterians departed from the doctrines of the Gospel, the mantle of the ejected ministers was transferred to the Independents. These were at first a much smaller body than the other, but the number of their churches gradually increased, and their interest became very considerable. It is greatly to their honor, that amidst surrounding declensions, they continued steadfast in the faith once delivered to the saints. The discipline of their churches was much stricter than that of the Presbyterians; and they kept a constant watch over the attendance and deportment of their members. In their academies they paid a particular attention to religious duties, and admitted none as candidates for the ministerial office, who did not previously discover marks of genuine religion. By these means, they possessed a constant succession of pastors, who were eminently devoted to their work; and whilst their brethren were exalting the religion of nature, they gloried only in the cross of Christ."

Our extracts from these volumes have hitherto related to a single subject. We are unwilling to close without presenting another, which may serve as a specimen of the manner of preaching adopted by the *old, evangelical* Presbyterians of England—that preaching under which their congregations rose, and their churches prospered. It is from the last discourse of the great Dr. Calamy, delivered early in the year 1732.

"Were I assured," says he, "that this was the last sermon that I should ever preach to you, I know not any better subject I could fasten upon, than Rom. xvi. 24. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all;"—and I can heartily say "Amen" to it. For I can freely say, as to you, as he with regard to Israel of old, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for you is, that you may be saved." And may you but have the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ with you, and I shall not doubt of it. But though this is my desire in the case of you all without exception; yet there are sundry of you, as to whom I might say, it is not the object of my hope. I know not how to suppose, that such of you as are sermon proof, and on whom the word of God maketh little or no impression; that allowedly run a round of repenting and sinning, and sinning and repenting; that though you name the name of Christ, yet depart not from iniquity; and though you profess to belong to him, yet live like the rest of the world; that run into temptations, instead of shunning them, and have Christ in your mouths, but the devil in your hearts, and rest in the form of godliness, while you are contentedly strangers to the power of it: I can't, I say, see how such of you can have the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ with you. You rather thrust it from you, and signify to him that you neither value him nor his grace a rush, and are able enough to shift for yourselves. No, you must be thoroughly changed and altered before you can have any lot or portion in this matter. The good Lord grant you may be convinced of the necessity of such a change, and stirred up to pray earnestly to him to effect it, and then may experience it.

There are, I apprehend; others of you, with respect to whom there is more ground for fear than hope. And I take this to be the case of such as remain contentedly ignorant of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, without earnestly laboring for divine knowledge; and of those who totally absent themselves from the Lord's table for fear of coming under too strict bonds to be religious; and of those that shut God out of their houses, and take no care about training up their children and servants in the knowledge and fear of God; that will plead any little trifle that offers, in excuse of non-attendance on God in his house; and as forward to spy moles in the eyes of their brethren, while they make nothing of beams in their own eyes. It may well enough be feared that such persons as these have not the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ with them, and if they really desire it, they ought to take care that such things as these be mended.

But then there are others of you, as to whom, I bless God, I can satisfactorily hope, that the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ will be constantly with you. All of you that endeavor more and more to deny yourselves, and mortify your earthly affections; lead a life of faith; have your conversation in heaven, and adorn the doctrine of God your Saviour in all things: You that watch over your hearts and tongues, your thoughts and ways; and are determined that whatever others do, you and yours will serve the Lord; you that are disposed to take up your cross when you are called to it; and count all things but loss that you may win Christ; you that can take upon you the most troublesome service, when your call is plain, trusting

him for assistance ; and are careful to manage the talents with which you are entrusted, so as may be most for the honor of him that bestows them on you ; you that walk humbly with God, and mourn after him, though you cannot delight in him to that degree you would aim at ; and say with the Psalmist, that you have none in heaven but him, none on earth that you desire besides him : All such as you, most certainly have the grace of God with you ; and may you have it more and more ! May it be upon you and yours ! May you have it in your own dwellings, and in your attendance on God in his house ! You will be much in my thoughts, and I hope I shall not be out of yours. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*"

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER AND GENERAL REVIEW. SEPTEMBER, 1830.

This number of the Examiner contains two articles, of which we think it proper to give our readers a short account, accompanied by remarks.* The first is entitled "Difficulties in Parishes." The writer "begins by glancing at the history" of parishes, "particularly in Massachusetts ;" and concludes with an estimate of the good and the evil resulting from the present divisions in parishes.

In the history here given of our parochial establishments, there are some inaccuracies requiring notice. It is alleged, for instance, that "the first planters" of Massachusetts "were, almost *without exception*, communicants." This would be a trivial error, were it not that great results, in our time, have been made to depend on it. All who are thoroughly acquainted with the early history of Massachusetts know that the statement is incorrect. The reader may see it refuted in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. i. p. 61, and in a note, p. 506 of the present number.

Again it is said,

"The third article of the Bill of Rights, guaranties to every parish or religious society, as they are exclusively responsible for the support of the minister, the exclusive right of electing him. Respect for an ancient usage, it is true, has, until lately, induced parishes almost universally to concede to the church the privilege of leading in the choice of a minister, and voting as a separate body. The church, however, in law, has no such right, and can claim it only as a matter of courtesy ; for the parish is competent to call and settle a minister, not only without the consent of the church, but against the declared wishes and solemn remonstrance of every member of it. Communicants, of course, are not excluded from voting in the choice of a minister, for they have a right to vote, and do vote, as members of the parish ; but the Constitution bars their right of voting twice on the same question, first in one capacity, and then in another."

* There is a long and valuable article in this number of the Examiner on the Rights of the Indians. Another on the same side, and of equal value, will be found in the North American Review, published the present month.

On this statement we have several remarks to offer. In the first place, the words "*religious societies*," in the third article of the bill of rights, were understood, at the time when our State Constitution was adopted, to *include churches*, and to secure to the churches the right of electing their pastors, as really as to parishes that of electing their ministers. "By '*religious societies*' we are to understand *the churches of Christ*." Again, "By '*religious societies*' I suppose we are to understand *the churches of Christ*." And again, "The Legislature have a right to require '*religious societies*' or *churches* to perform a civil duty." This is the very language of the times, quoted from the public discussions attending the adoption of our State Constitution. We present it to show *how* the Constitution was then understood, and in *what sense* it was received and consented to by the people.

2. Venerable men, clergymen and others, who lived at the time when the Constitution was adopted, declared shortly afterwards, have declared since, and are ready to declare now, that the idea was at that period *unknown*, that the Constitution went to deprive the churches of their immemorial rights, in regard to the election of their pastors. When this thought was suggested, in 1784, by Gov. Sullivan to the late Dr. Thatcher of Boston, he replied, "*Ministers did not suppose that there would be such a total change in the system of their church government, as Mr. S. hath suggested; neither had this gentleman himself ideas of this nature at that time, (the time of the adoption of the Constitution) unless I am much mistaken.*"—The venerable Dr. Dana, of Ipswich, wrote as follows, in 1827.

"I have a perfect remembrance of what passed in 1780, when the Constitution was pending. After the frame of it was voted in Convention, it was sent to all the towns for their adoption, with such variations as two-thirds of them might wish for. It was read in town meeting where I live, and a committee was appointed to consider it and report. I was on that committee. Besides this, it was read publicly, and considered by parts for several days. Explanations were likewise given, as they were desired, by a venerable member who had attended the Convention. At all these meetings I was present. But *at none of them all did I meet with one intimation, or expressed apprehension, of such a kind of exclusive right of towns, parishes, &c. as we are now called to believe in. In fact, had we then believed that such an exclusion of the church was intended, it is past conjecture, that nine-tenths of this ancient town would have rejected it. Nor is it believed that it was with such an understanding, that the Convention itself agreed, or could have agreed in it. In every view, their silence on the subject is conclusive evidence.*

Respectfully,
J. DANA."

3. Unitarians themselves, until within a few years, contradicted the pretensions now set up, as to the controlling and *absorbing* power of parishes, and the utter destitution of power and right on the part of the churches. The council which ordained Mr. Lamson, in the year 1818, declare that church and parish have each "*a right to elect a pastor for itself*," and that "*this right is secured to the church by the essential principles of Congregational polity.*" Did the gentlemen composing this council, the *corps d'elite* of American Unitarians, believe that the Constitution of Massachusetts went to annul "*the essential principles of Congregational polity*"?

This council, which was called by the parish and settled Mr. Lamson only as teacher of the parish, expressly *disclaimed* the "power to set a pastor over the church *against its consent*." But it is contended in the article before us, that "the parish is competent to call and settle a minister" [who, as the connexion implies, will have charge of the church] "*against the declared wishes and solemn remonstrance of every member of it*."

We are further told in this article, that it is enough for the communicants, that "they have a right to vote, as members of the parish." But Mr. Lamson's communicants did not think it enough, that they had voted, as members of the parish. They held what they called a church meeting, after his ordination, and formally elected him to be their pastor.*

Speaking of the attempts which have been made at different times to divide and break up the Congregational parishes of Massachusetts, the writer mentions the disturbances in the early days of Mrs. Hutchinson and her followers; the operations of the Baptists; the separations which followed the labors of Whitefield; and then adds,

"After all, the mortal wound inflicted on Congregational ascendancy, was inflicted, as such wounds commonly are, in the house of its friends. From time immemorial, ministers and churches of this denomination had been of different persuasions on points deemed by some fundamental. This, however, though sometimes the occasion of sharp controversies, and partial and local estrangement, had never led to anything like a dismemberment of the sect. But in 1814 and 1815, several publications appeared, impeaching the orthodoxy of some of the Congregational clergy, and accusing them of practising dishonest concealments, and calling on the people, in the words of the apostle,—'Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing.' From that hour, the ascendancy of Congregationalists, for some time the sole, and until then the predominant sect, was at an end in this State. The house was divided against itself, and it fell."

The design of this passage is to throw the blame of the separation which has taken place in the old Congregational establishments of Massachusetts upon the heads of the Orthodox. But before they consent to bear the blame, they must be allowed to state the case as it is.—Until within less than fifty years, there was not an avowed Unitarian in New England, taking the term Unitarian in its widest sense. What some individuals were privately, among their confidential friends, we pretend not to say; but no man preached and professed, openly and explicitly, any form of Unitarian doctrine. And until within less than twenty years, no Congregational minister of Massachusetts professed to deny the doctrine of atonement, and some other of the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. In 1812, Mr. Parkman describes most of the Congregational ministers of Boston as "holding high and exalted views of the person and mediation of Jesus Christ, *resting on the merits of his atonement, his cross, and passion*, and zealous to pay the honor which they believe

* For the authorities on which quotations have here been made, and for a full examination of this important subject, we must refer our readers to a review in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. ii. pp. 374—384,—an article to which no reply has ever been made or attempted, and we presume never will be.

due to his name.”* And so late as 1815, Dr. Channing complains repeatedly and bitterly of Dr. Worcester, for intimating that Unitarians “give up the doctrine of the atonement.” This doctrine “is not rejected by Unitarians.” “Unitarianism does not exclude the doctrine.”† To what purpose, then, is it to assert, that “from time immemorial,” there have been differences of opinion among Congregational ministers. “From time immemorial,” there have not been open Unitarians in Massachusetts. Nor until within a *short period* have there been those among us, who professed to believe, and to disbelieve, what Unitarians now do. Who among our fathers denied the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures? Who regarded the Saviour as no more than a mortal man? Who denied the doctrine of atonement by his death, and justification by faith in his blood? Who denied the divine institution of the Sabbath, the separate existence of the soul, the doctrine of fallen spirits, and of a general judgement, and the eternal punishment of those who die in their sins?‡ Yes; and who among our fathers is known to have held fellowship, or to have been willing for a moment to hold it, with those who did reject these solemn and vital truths? That there has been and is a separation, wide and visible, among those denominated Congregationalists in Massachusetts, is most true. But who are responsible for this separation? At whose door does the sin of it lie? At whose hands must it hereafter be required? Are those in fault, who have adhered to the doctrines and discipline of the New England churches—continued steadfast in the faith of their ancestors—and done precisely what they have good reason to believe those venerable Orthodox Congregationalists would have done, in similar circumstances? Or does the blame of the separation lie altogether on the other side? upon those who have gone out from us, because they were not of us? who have secretly but *radically* departed from the principles on which these churches were founded? who have embraced and inculcate another Gospel? who have so widely strayed, so fearfully corrupted themselves in point of doctrine, as to lay a *necessity* upon their former brethren to withhold their fellowship?—These are indeed searching and solemn questions, but obviously they are the proper ones, bringing out the true grounds of this lamented separation, and fixing the blame of it where it will be found to lie, in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed. The Orthodox of New England, be it repeated and remembered, are not the separatists in this dreadful schism. They stand, to the present hour, upon the foundations of their fathers, and are struggling to preserve these venerable foundations, against the assaults of those who have wandered from them, and are seeking to destroy them. If the old Congregational house

* Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. ii. p. 225.

† See Remarks on Dr. Worcester's Second Letter, pp. 17, 18.

‡ That American Unitarians, or many of them, do reject the doctrines here specified, is fully shown in a Tract recently published, entitled “An Exhibition of Unitarianism in Quotations from its Standard Authors and Works.” A writer in the number of the Christian Examiner now before us, speaking of the “general judgement,” says, “I do not believe there ever will be any.” It “is a mere coinage of the human brain. Certainly the Scriptures assert no such thing.” vol. ix. p. 30.

has become divided against itself, (as to some extent it has) then let those of the household who, by their innovations and artifices, have excited and created the division, look well to the consequences, and consider well what account they are to render, at the bar of public opinion on earth, and before the throne of God hereafter, for the part they have taken in originating evils—which may outlive the world—which may endure forever.

In the concluding part of the article before us, the author endeavors to dissuade Unitarian minorities from separating from the parishes of the Orthodox, and establishing worship by themselves. And if the considerations he urges are correct, he certainly has the best reasons for his advice. "More persons," he tells us, "in this country have been made Unitarians by Calvinistic than by Unitarian preaching;" and he declares that, were it not "for the existence of a Unitarian sect, there could be no obstacle to the rapid and universal prevalence of Unitarianism." p. 19. Now if these things are indeed so, and if the conductors of the Examiner truly believe them, then doubtless they do well to dissuade any, and all, over whom they have influence, from deserting the parishes and preaching of the Orthodox. But on the same principles, why would it not be wise for them to proceed further? Why not break up their Unitarian associations and establishments—the appendages of the sect—and all consent to sit down together under the droppings of the Calvinistic sanctuaries? The sole obstacle in the way of what they hold to be the Gospel would thus be removed, and the truth would have free course, run, and be glorified.

On this subject we only add, that to Orthodox minorities in Unitarian parishes, we give directly the opposite advice. To such we would say, without hesitation, 'If you cannot enjoy the faithful preaching of the Gospel in your present connexion, by all means separate. Do it speedily; do it decidedly; and be not deterred by expected sacrifices and difficulties, or by the consideration that you are few and feeble. Better meet in a private room, as the primitive disciples often did, or even "in dens and caves of the earth," and there hear of *salvation through a crucified Redeemer*, than to assemble in the most gorgeous temples, with admiring multitudes, to be soothed and deluded by that "instruction which causeth to err from the words of knowledge." Better dispense altogether with the services of a public teacher, and read and pray for mutual edification, than to sit under the ministrations of one whom you are obliged to regard as a 'blind leader of the blind.'—We are far from recommending that the ancient parochial establishments of New England should be rashly assailed, or needlessly broken up. We do not advise our friends to depart from them, in any case, without an urgent, imperious necessity. But it should be borne in mind, that these establishments were instituted only as *means* to a vastly important end. Consequently, when they fall into such hands that, instead of being a means to this end, they are an effectual bar and hindrance to it; they then have lost their importance, become a nuisance, and the same evangelical spirit which led to their formation demands that they be taken out of the way. We repeat, let no one be en-

couraged by our advice to break away from the existing parishes capriciously or needlessly. Let no one secede, so long as he can hear the Gospel faithfully preached in his present connexion. But when there is no longer a reasonable prospect of this, then we say, 'Depart at once. Confer not with flesh and blood. You have a full right and liberty to go, and this is plainly your duty. Crosses and reproaches you must expect to bear. Sacrifices of time, labor, and property you will be called to make. But surely you may better dispense with superfluities, and even with some present conveniences, than with the bread and water of life. Better leave your children with a diminished patrimony, than without the faithful preaching of the Gospel. If the Lord deal with you, as he has with others in similar circumstances, he will first try you, humble you, purify you, and then bless you. Be faithful, be prayerful, trust simply in him, and do your duty; and if he deal with you as he has with others, the mountains before you will shortly be levelled into plains, and your little one shall become a thousand.'

It ought to be said of the article on which we have here remarked, that it is written with apparent coolness and deliberation, and contains passages (some of which we intended to have quoted) which are very true, and well worthy the consideration of our readers.

THE other article in the late number of the Examiner, of which we proposed to give our readers some account, is entitled "The evil consequences of an Injudicious Use of the Old Testament." It is here insisted, that the religion of the Old Testament "was adapted to a single people, and to an ignorant age," and "*no more suited to Christians*, than infant instruction to the manhood of the mind." "Superstition has found its *strong hold* in the Hebrew Scriptures, and can never be dislodged, till those remarkable writings are better and more generally understood." "By taking the lessons of *moral-ity* from the Old Testament, we *lower our standard of duty*." "How then can men, with any consistency, go to the Old Testament for their moral examples?" "It is universally understood that our Saviour came to *reform* the Old Testament morality." The reviewers in the Examiner complain that, "not merely the ignorant, but those who might know better, regard those writings [the Old Testament] as equally important with the Gospel." "They get their ideas of God and duty from the Old Testament. If they want instruction, encouragement, or consolation, they go to the Old Testament. They are in the constant habit of drinking from that broken and moss-grown cistern, though the living water is flowing at their feet."

To an "injudicious use of the Old Testament" (and by an injudicious use, they evidently mean an *undue attention* and *veneration*) these reviewers attribute most of the errors which now infest the Christian church. To this they "ascribe much of the narrowness of feeling, the servility of devotion, which dishonors the religious spirit of the present day." From the Hebrew Scriptures, "men borrow incorrect impressions of the nature of God." "Little, comparatively speaking, is said" in these Scriptures, "of the *moral*

perfections of his nature, which entitle and recommend him to the reverence and love of enlightened minds." "On the contrary, *everything* gives the impression that he exists in a human form." "The Old Testament reminds us, not so much of God's mercy, as of his exalted power. It holds out, comparatively, but *little encouragement to repentance and prayer*, and in the *whole* of its spirit and letter, awakens fear rather than love." "God seldom appears there as a kind and merciful Father." "There are few, we believe, who cannot feel in themselves the *bad consequences* of being more familiar with the Hebrew than the Christian representations of God." "Can any man doubt that we *perpetuate this delusion*" respecting the Divine character, "by taking our idea of God from ancient prophets, instead of later and milder interpreters of his will?"

The language of the Old Testament in some instances, "which can be excused only by the *savage character of the age in which it was spoken*, has been brought as a precedent for the indulgence of *revenge* in the cause of religion."—"There is another *common and pernicious error, which may be traced directly to the use of the Old Testament*, without regard to the design of its parts, and the times when and for which they were written. It is the doctrine that misfortunes are sent as judgements for sin."—After saying all this, and much more to the same purpose, respecting those Scriptures, *all* of which an apostle describes as "given by inspiration of God, and *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," these reviewers add, "*Let no one charge us with undervaluing the Old Testament*, because we say that it *does not contain Christianity*, and that *MEN DO WRONG TO GO TO IT TO LEARN the duties, feelings and consolations of the Christian religion*. Deny it who can!"

We have not space, nor do we think it necessary, to go into a particular examination of the views here expressed. Our principal object has been to expose them, and to show our readers in what light by far the greater portion of that holy book which we call *the Bible* is now regarded by not a few in the midst of us. It would be easy to prove, did time permit, that nearly every position assumed in the foregoing quotations is false;—that the religion of the two Testaments is the same—that the views of God exhibited in both are the same—that their moral instructions are in general the same—that the connexion between the two is so inseparably intimate, that the one cannot be properly studied or understood independent of the other, nor can one be discarded or disparaged without destroying the credit of the other. Where do we find more sublime expressions of the spirituality and all-pervading presence of the Supreme Being, than occur in the Old Testament? "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." Where do we find a purer morality, on earth or in heaven, than that inculcated in the ten commandments, and more summarily in the general law of the Old Testament, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might"? And where does

God display his mercy, his forbearance, his tender concern for transgressors, and his readiness on easy terms to forgive, in a more affecting manner, than in the Old Testament? "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin." "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? My heart is turned within me, and my repentings are kindled together." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"

We have long known that the Liberalists of this region had no great respect for the Old Testament, considered even as "a human composition;" and we have long looked for some decisive expression of their feelings in regard to it. But much as we were prepared to expect, we acknowledge that the views exhibited in this article have surprised us. We did not expect to be told that "superstition has found its *strong hold* in the Hebrew Scriptures;" that they are "*no more suited to Christians*, than infant instruction to the manhood of the mind;" and that by going to them for lessons of morality, "we *lower* our standard of duty." We did not expect to hear it *objected* to us, that we "get our ideas of God and duty from the Old Testament," and that we seek "instruction, encouragement, and consolation" from the same divine source. We did not expect to hear of "narrowness of feeling," and "servility of devotion," of "delusion" perpetuated, "revenge" encouraged, "pernicious errors" inculcated, and other "bad consequences," as resulting from the study of any portion of the inspired writings. We did not expect to hear that the doctrine of Christ is not contained in the Old Testament, and that "*men do wrong to go to it* to learn the duties, feelings, and consolations of the Christian religion."

True, we are told of "the grandeur of its inspirations," and "the plaintive music of its hymns;" but if what is asserted in other connexions be correct, these are fitted only for the infancy of mind, and are so commingled with much that is objectionable, as to render the whole a dangerous volume. On the principles laid down in this article, who would dare say, as our Saviour did, to a mixed assembly, "*Search the Scriptures*," (meaning the Old Testament,) "for in them ye think ye have *eternal life*,"* and *they are they which testify of me*?" Or what preacher of the Gospel would commend his hearers, as Paul did his, for *searching the Scriptures of the Old Testament daily*, to see whether his doctrine was true or false? It is not difficult to see whither these principles tend, and to what, unless resisted, they must grow. Let them be believed, and carried out in practice, and what is the Bible worth to

* The writer of this article asserts that the Hebrew Scriptures "*never taught the immortality of the soul*." How then did the Jews find in them the doctrine of "*eternal life*?"

us? No more than any ancient story—the relic of a remote people, and of a distant age. “Mixed up with the doubtfulness of old traditions, and with systems of superannuated errors,” nothing can be certainly known or proved by it, and we are left on a sea of doubts, at the mercy of our own imaginings.

To the strictly *Christian* community, the Bible, we apprehend, was never more precious than at the present moment. The insidious attempts to slip it through their fingers, and take it from them ere they were aware of it, have been exposed; and they cling to it with a firmer grasp than ever. They come to regard it more as their *last hope*—that “sure word of prophecy to which they do well to take heed, as to a LIGHT—*shining in a DARK PLACE*.”

2. THE UNITARIAN ADVOCATE AND RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY. SEPTEMBER, 1830.

OUR single object in noticing this number of the Advocate, is to call attention to an article containing some remarks on Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing. Nor shall we go, at present, into a particular examination of the misrepresentations, the unfounded and ridiculous assertions,* the concessions and contradictions, which occur in this article. For, in the first place, the conductors of the Advocate profess to have reserved some important topics to be discussed in a future number; and we certainly wish to hear them through, before we attempt a general reply. And besides, it is our intention, ere long, to take up the Letter of Mr. Stuart, and in connexion with it the various remarks to which it may have given rise. We confine ourselves now to that part of the article before us, in which reference is had to the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

The conductors of the Advocate speak of ours as a “bold, bad work,” and declare that they “will not pollute their pages with formal extracts.” As some apology for the perturbed feelings and denunciations of these gentlemen, it should be recollected that we once had the misfortune to drive them, or their predecessors, into a most unlucky corner. The circumstances were these: We complained, in our introductory article, (vol. i. p. 5,) that Unitarians misrepresented the sentiments of the Orthodox. The conductors of the Advocate denied the charge, declaring that they had, “for years, habitually consulted every Orthodox publication which was thrown in their way,” and that “*the very creed inserted in the Spirit of the Pilgrims expressed precisely what they found represented in works on the opposite side.*” vol. i. p. 193. In reply, we quoted numerous passages from a printed sermon* of the then editor of the Advocate,

* We say *ridiculous* assertions, and give the following as a specimen. “Take another case: there are *thousands* of such. A parish accustomed to hear Unitarian preaching becomes divided, and an Orthodox society is set up!” Where are these *thousands* of Unitarian parishes, which become divided, and in which Orthodox societies are set up? Not in this country, surely, nor in *this world*. The writer's ideas must have been wonderfully expanded, when he gave utterance to the sentences above quoted.

* This Sermon, with all its gross misrepresentations, was then, and is now, circulated as a tract, by the American Unitarian Association.

and requested him to point out anything in what he called the creed of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, which was at all equivalent to the representations he had made. vol. i. p. 327. This, of course, he could not do; and consequently he stood convicted before the public, first, of grossly misrepresenting the sentiments of the Orthodox, and secondly, of denying that this had been done. As this was not a very comfortable position, an attempt was made, after several months, to escape from it. The gentleman took *one* only of our quotations from his sermon, that in which he had represented the Orthodox as holding "that God brings men into life *incapable* of goodness"—not attempting to free the others from the charge we had fastened on them;—and what did he do with this one? Did he show, as in duty bound, that the creed of the Spirit of the Pilgrims taught the same sentiment? No, nothing of this,—but only that the Westminster Assembly, and Calvin, and some others, had used similar language. In replying the second time, we addressed the gentleman directly as follows:

"This, Mr. Editor, is not the point. What have *we* taught? In what part of the creed of the Spirit of the Pilgrims is it said, 'that God brings men into life *incapable* of goodness'? *Show us the passage*, and then we will admit, that in this particular you have not misrepresented us: and that in denying the charge of misrepresentation, you have spoken the truth. But until you show us this passage, and others, in what you call our creed, of similar import to those we previously quoted from your sermon, we are bound to repeat the charge of misrepresentation against you, and to say that in denying it you have not spoken the truth." vol. i. p. 560.

Here the editor, and those so associated as to be responsible with him, were again cornered and caught, in a situation from which they could not possibly escape, without retracing their steps; and here the subject has rested from that time to the present.—We have thought proper to refer to these things, for the purpose of reminding the conductors of the Advocate that there are some old affairs yet unsettled between us,—and also of excusing them, in the best manner we are able, for the excited feelings under which they seem to labor, whenever they have occasion to speak our name.*

These gentlemen complain, in the article before us, that we have attempted to fasten on Unitarians "the stale charge of Universalism." Now this is not representing the case so bad as it is. We have not only *attempted* to fasten this charge on the great body of American Unitarians—we have actually done it. We have proved, beyond all question, that the charge is true. Having observed for a long time the shuffling, inconsistent course which some were pursuing in regard to Universalism, we concluded to take up the subject in earnest, and give it a thorough investigation. We first defined Universalism; and, secondly, proved that "leading Unitarians in the

* We quote a single sentence from the article before us, that the Orthodox may see in what manner their sentiments are still represented in some Unitarian publications. The Orthodox "system teaches us to regard a *majority* of our fellow men as the enemies of goodness, outcasts and reprobates, being born subject to God's wrath and curse, and doomed, by the *necessity of their nature*, to endure never-ending torments in hell fire forever, while a *few, arbitrarily selected* from the corrupt mass, are regenerated and saved by a *miraculous agency*." p. 122.

United States, with possibly a few exceptions, do," (what they allege to the contrary notwithstanding) "believe the doctrine of Universal Salvation, and are, in everything but the name, Universalists." In support of this position, we urged nine specific arguments, the last of which was the *confessions* of Unitarians themselves. Will the conductors of the Advocate undertake to meet and refute these arguments? Or will they take it upon them to say, that the great body of Unitarians in the United States believe the doctrine of eternal punishment? They will not say this. They dare not. But if those who die in their sins are not punished forever, what becomes of them after death? Are they annihilated, or restored? Some few may adopt the former opinion, but we have it on the authority of their own publications, that "the great body of Unitarians in this country *believe in the final restoration of all men to happiness*;"*—and this is Universalism.

Another ground of complaint is, that "in defiance of all decency," we have charged Unitarians with infidelity. After what has appeared in our last two numbers, we have but little to add in regard to this subject. We have undertaken to show what constitutes infidelity; or to mark the distinction between the Christian and the infidel.† In doing this, we ascertained—could we help it?—that certain distinguished Unitarian writers, in Europe and in this country, had clearly involved themselves on the side of the infidel. They had denied the inspiration of the Scriptures, and did not hesitate to charge the sacred writers with mistakes and errors, inaccuracies and contradictions, in such manner as to destroy all confidence in them, as furnishing a perfect standard of truth and duty. Will the conductors of the Advocate deny the facts here alleged? Or will they pretend that, if correctly stated, they do not amount to a species of infidelity? They have themselves denounced the Liberalists of Germany as deists;—will they task themselves to frame a definition of deism, which shall fairly include the Germans, and fairly exclude certain writers in the Christian Examiner?

Again, it is said we have charged Unitarians "with a disposition to conceal their sentiments, to equivocate, to evade, and even to deny them when questioned." And again we reply, have we charged them with anything in relation to this subject which we have not proved—fully proved—proved on the testimony of Unitarians themselves? Let the proof we have furnished be fairly met, if it can be. Or if it cannot be met; if it is conclusive and irrefragable; if it establishes the point for which it was adduced: then how is our correspondent to blame for introducing it, when professedly giving a history of Unitarian management, and of the manner in which the doctrine has prevailed in this country?

* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iii. pp. 220, 221.

† This distinction, as it seems to us, may be brought within a narrow compass. The infidel disbelieves *something* pertaining to the Bible, which the Christian believes. What is this? Not the *whole* Bible, and all it contains. Perhaps no infidel ever lived, who would say of the Bible that he disbelieved it *all*. How much, then, does he disbelieve? Why as much as he pleases, i. e. *all that seems to him unreasonable*. And this is precisely what is done by some professed Unitarians.

The editor of the Advocate, writing on this subject in a previous volume, admits "that the Unitarian controversy was, at a certain period, kept out of the pulpits in our metropolis," but insists that "the fact that they were Unitarians *was not hidden by the clergy from their flocks*," but that they were "*known to be*, what they really were, Unitarians." vol. ii. p. 117. But how does this comport with the testimony of Mr. Parkman?

"With the exception of two or three, or at most four or five heads of families, I may safely say, that *there is scarcely a parishioner in Boston who would not be shocked at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism*."—"There is now one more gentleman in Boston, who, with his intimate friends, may perhaps be considered a Unitarian; but he maintains the same *cautious reserve*, and from neither his sermons, his prayers, or his *private conversation*, could I infer that he was a Unitarian."^{*}

And how will the conductors of the Advocate reconcile their account of the matter with the following testimony, which came to us, unsolicited, from a very respectable lady now living in Massachusetts? The letter has been in our possession more than a year; we had concluded not to publish it; but as the subject continues to be agitated, it is best that it should be brought into as clear light as possible. For a very obvious reason, names will be omitted. They shall be told, however, if the facts are denied.

"DEAR SIR,

"The Unitarians in former years not only concealed their sentiments from the public, but also *from members of their own congregations*. My mother, the wife of Col. ———, formerly of Boston, after an absence of a few years from the city, returned, I think, in 1809, and took a house near ——— street church. Although she had joined the Old South at the early age of fifteen, and, according to the custom of that church, had given in, at the time, her "experience" in writing, yet, from her proximity to ——— street church, she attended the preaching of the Rev. Mr. ———. At length, it was reported that Mr. ——— did not believe in the supreme divinity of Christ. This led her to fear lest, by hearing him, she, with her family, should be drawn away from "the faith once delivered to the saints." As her safest course, therefore, she wrote to him, stating what she had heard respecting his sentiments, and saying that, if it were untrue, she should be much pleased to sit under his ministry; but if true, she should not dare to hear him; and concluded by requesting a *direct and explicit avowal of his sentiments*." [A very reasonable request, certainly, from a parishioner, a communicant, an anxious mother, to her minister.] "To this letter, he made no reply. After ten days or a fortnight, he called and made a morning visit. He was sociable and agreeable, but not a word was said respecting the subject of the letter. As he rose to go, she inquired of him, whether he had received a letter from her. He answered in the affirmative, and was proceeding to the door, when she asked him, 'What reply, sir, do you make to the inquiry there stated?' He then attempted to show her the *impropriety of endeavoring to learn the doctrinal views of a minister in any other way than by hearing his sermons*," [in this way she could not learn them,] "and closed the conversation by saying, 'If you wish to know my sentiments, you must attend my preaching, and learn them in that way.'—This, sir, is a statement of Unitarian concealment practised before my own eyes, on a beloved parent, who is now deceased.

Very respectfully yours, ———.

"May 5th, 1829."

* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. ii. p. 224.

This communication needs no comment. The Advocate admits that Unitarianism, "at a certain period, was kept out of the *pulpits* in our metropolis;" but insists that it "*was not hidden by the clergy from their flocks.*" But here we see that it *was* "hidden by the clergy from their flocks"—with the exception, perhaps, of a few of the initiated, whom Mr. Parkman calls their "intimate friends"—and so hidden, that an explicit avowal, one way or the other, could not be obtained. Let the situation of the good people of Boston, at that critical period, be, for a moment, contemplated. And let the question be asked, What could they have done? Suspicions were abroad as to the Orthodoxy of their ministers; and, as the event has proved, *well-founded suspicions*. But from their preaching, they could determine nothing; and if they addressed them privately, and in the most cautious and respectful manner, still, no explicit answer could be obtained. This then—be it known to the world—was the manner in which Unitarianism came in here. It came in by stealth and artifice—by an abuse of the confidence of a generous, unsuspecting people. *It "crept in—unawares."*

We are charged, in the last place, with not "sparing individual character;" and in proof of this, reference is made to the Review of Dr. Channing on Associations, in our number for March, 1830.—Those who think that Dr. Channing was treated with undue severity in that article, will do well to consider the circumstances under which it was written. Here, the acknowledged leader of the Unitarian party—that party, whose boast has been a monopoly almost of talents, wealth, and influence, especially in this region—comes forward and scoffs (for we call it scoffing) at revivals of religion; objects to nearly all our benevolent associations; declares that the fourth commandment is no longer binding, and that men are under no obligations, from any *divine command*, to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Others must judge of this subject as they think proper; but *we* felt that it was time to speak; and to speak strongly; in this manner we attempted to speak, and the attempt, on our part, will doubtless be repeated, whenever a like occasion occurs.

Of the conductors of the Advocate, we take our leave for this time, with a single remark: There is a wide difference between accusing a respectable class of men *falsely and maliciously*—and investigating and publishing the *truth* about them, for a *benevolent and important purpose*. Establish the point, gentlemen, that we have done the *first* of these, and we will make *you* all the reparation in our power. But our having done the *last*, is no evidence that we are chargeable with the *first*, nor have you any ground or reason for drawing such a conclusion.

3. *An Apology for the Jews.* A Sermon. By the Rev. W. H. Furness, of Philadelphia. Liberal Preacher, vol. iv. No. I.

We do not object to this discourse, on account of its tendency to excite sympathy in behalf of the dispersed Jews, but on account of the *reasons urged* in favor of sympathy. Mr. Furness would fain

have us believe that the religion of the modern Jew, and that of the Christian, are very nearly the same ; and that we ought to regard the sincere Jew much as we would a faithful brother in the Lord. The Jew embraces the Old Testament, and the Christian the New, and hence the religion of both, in all essential points, must be alike. "The faith to which the Jew now adheres was the faith of Moses, and of Samuel, of David and Isaiah, of all the illustrious kings and prophets of Israel." "He is" therefore "near to being a Christian, and is in fact, I am afraid, a much better Christian, than very many of those who glory in the name."

In remarking on this specious and plausible statement, we admit and insist (the Christian Examiner to the contrary notwithstanding) that the religion of the two Testaments is essentially the same ; but does the modern Jew truly believe and embrace the Old Testament ? Is his faith that of Samuel, and David, and Isaiah, and the prophets ? Is he a true disciple and follower of Moses ? Mr. F. answers, without hesitation, in the affirmative ; but, with equal promptness and decision, our Saviour answers in the negative. 'Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed *me* ; for he *wrote of me*.' Paul, too, affirms, that in preaching Christ and him crucified, he 'said none other things than what the prophets and Moses *did say should come*.' The writings of the Old Testament all look forward to Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah ; so that it is impossible for a person correctly to understand and receive these writings, and not be a disciple of the Son of God. Strange ! that a professed minister of Christ should stand up and declare, that a believer in the Old Testament could reject the New—that a true follower of Moses could despise him of whom Moses spake—and that a religion which spurns the divine Saviour of men can be essentially the same with that which embraces him !

4. *On the Use of Poisoned Drinks.* A Sermon by the Rev. J. G. Palfrey, of Boston. Liberal Preacher, vol. iv. No. II.

Mr. Palfrey is favorably known to the public already, as an efficient advocate in the cause of temperance. We welcome his appearance again in the same noble cause. In the sermon before us, he takes the high ground of regarding distilled spirits as poisonous, and urges a total abstinence from them, "except as a medicine, and then under a responsible professional oversight."

"We do not *call* spirits poison. But I see a man with a countenance hideously bloated, and in hue fiery red or deadly pale. His pulse indicates a burning fever, or else the low state of typhus inflammation. He has no more the power of voluntary motion than if he were palsied. His swollen tongue refuses to articulate, or is helplessly protruded from his mouth. His deep and distressed breathing is like that of apoplexy. Will any one give me a definition of the action of poisons, which will explain to me that that man is not poisoned ? Will any one make me understand that if he had drugged himself with arsenic or hemlock, he might have been poisoned, but that having only drugged himself with alcohol, he is not so ? I see another, consumptive, or paralytic, or dropsical, with no appetite or no digestion, sober enough now perhaps, but along with one or more of these morbid affections, nervous or idiotic at the same time, and I learn that his habit has been to ply himself with the potent agent which has been named. And am I to say that he is not dying by slow poison, if slow it were, merely because he found it on the inn-keeper's

shelves, and not on the apothecary's? Is that a philosophical, is it so much as a specious discrimination?"

On the subject of wines, the remarks of Mr. P. are deeply interesting, and cannot fail to be useful. After saying that he should prefer the general use of wines to that of spirits—and who would not, as the less of two evils? he adds,

"But, perhaps, we have much less to do with this question about the wines, than we imagine. Perhaps what we call by that name deserve to be suspected by us on other grounds than what are commonly alone adduced. I apprehend, my friends, that we see very little wine in this country. I suppose, that, for example, the vineyards which yield the Marsala grape, do not produce more wine in a year, than is drunk under that name, in a year, in our single State. I should not be surprised to be assured that they do not produce more than is drunk in our metropolis alone. I suppose that what can, with any great propriety be called wine, is scarcely to be met with, except occasionally at the tables of the opulent; and we, whose regard for our purse, to speak of nothing better, must needs prevent us from putting ourselves to very free expense for such a luxury, I conceive need, out of regard to our health, to say no more, to refrain from meddling very freely with what goes by the name of wine. By a *common* wine, or a *table* wine, if that rather be the name by which the inferior quality is disguised, I understand to be meant nothing else than a corrupt imitation of wine. I suppose it to be undeniable that very soon after a wine becomes common among us, it becomes corrupt and unwholesome. Many of us can remember when the wine of Lisbon was in extensive use. At first it was understood to come pure, and the demand for it naturally increased. To meet this increased demand came next an adulterated mixture, and then a most vicious counterfeit. When, at last, every one who touched it, though it were sparingly, found that he received the admonition of a head ache, or a fever, it was abandoned, and the wine of Vidonia was adopted in its place, and went through the same popularity, the same process of treatment, and the same dismission. The wines of Sicily next reached us, and for the like reason, are about to be pronounced, by an unanimous voice, intolerable. It is scarcely half a score of years since the name of the wine of Champagne was known to our dealers, and already, it is said, that a very insignificant proportion of what is sold and consumed under that name among us, ever heaved on a wave of the Atlantic. How, where, and by whom these substances are manufactured, by which trusting consumers are poisoned, of course no one can tell, any more than where counterfeit money is struck; for secrecy is the life of the traffic. What are the ingredients, however, the faithful test of chemical analysis with indubitable certainty discloses. Along with some inconsiderable basis of the liquid which is to give its name to the compound whole, and a copious addition of alcohol and water, they are such, according to the particular case, as a decoction of the oak wood to give astringency; elder flowers and log wood to heighten the color; alum, gypsum, and potash, to clarify; and sugar of lead, one of the most active poisons, to cover acidity."

5. *A Scriptural Answer to the Question, How may I know that I am an adopted child of God?* By Nathaniel Dwight. Norwich: J. Durham. 1830. pp. 210.

The subject of this treatise is one of great practical importance, and we are happy to say that the manner in which it is treated is, in general, satisfactory. The author describes the change through which every person must pass, in order to become a child of God, and dwells largely upon the various scriptural evidences of being in an adopted, justified state. The evidences suggested are not indeed those which would be most strenuously insisted on by some religionists; but they are those, we are persuaded, on which the

inspired writers most frequently insist, and on which principal reliance should be placed,—such as “Humility, Self-denial, Christian Forbearance, and Watchfulness, Forgiveness of Injuries, Weanedness from the World,” &c. The work is well recommended by respected ministerial brethren in Connecticut, and we cordially assent to all that they have said in its favor. “Amid the activity of the age, there is danger that experimental religion may, in some measure, be overlooked, and essays like this are peculiarly necessary to check such a result.”

6. *Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D. D., formerly pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, Rhode Island.* With an Appendix. By John Ferguson, pastor of the East Church in Attleborough, Mass. Boston: Leonard W. Kimball. 1830. pp. 196.

The subject of this Memoir was an eminently great and good man. He was one of the few distinguished individuals who labored to withstand the outbreking floods of error, and to keep alive the holy fire of truth and godliness, in times of great spiritual darkness and declension. By a prolonged life of devotedness and usefulness in the church of God, he seems as a connecting link between the revivals near the middle of the last century, and those which have occurred within the memory of the present generation.

Dr. Hopkins was born, September 17, 1721, and by his pious parents was dedicated to the ministry of the altar from his birth. In his youth, he was so distinguished for sobriety and correctness of deportment, that by many he was regarded as a true Christian, and consequently was encouraged to make a public profession of religion, while yet a stranger to its saving power. He was awakened from his self-righteous slumber, while a member of college, through the instrumentality of David Brainerd. His feelings, at this critical and solemn period, the reader will find detailed, in his own words, in our number for January (pp. 40, 41.) of the present volume. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of President Edwards, of whom he was afterwards the intimate and confidential friend. From 1743 to 1769, he was pastor of the church in Great Barrington, Mass.; and from 1770 to the time of his death—through painful vicissitudes and many trials—he continued pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R. I.

While at Great Barrington, he was instrumental in the conversion of two individuals, who were afterwards burning and shining lights in the churches of Massachusetts. The first of these was the Rev. David Sanford, long pastor of the West Church in Medway. The circumstances attending this interesting event are thus detailed:

“The Rev. David Sanford, late pastor of the church in Medway, Mass., had at an early age received a liberal education. The intention of his parents was to prepare him for the ministry; but being destitute of religion when he arrived at manhood, his attention was directed to agriculture. As a farmer, he was located in the town of which Mr. Hopkins was the minister. They married sisters. But although thus nearly related, Mr. Sanford was a bitter

opposer of the religion and preaching of his brother Hopkins. To him the preaching of Mr. Hopkins appeared contemptible and foolish; and on this ground he justified himself in giving only an occasional attendance on his ministry. But although he thus sought to justify his neglect of the instituted means of grace, his conscience was by no means easy. As an evidence of his state of mind at this time, and the rankling opposition of his heart, he afterwards mentioned, that while at work on his farm, on removing a log which had become embedded in the ground, his attention was directed to a number of very minute, and to him uncommon animalcules. After observing them for a moment, he thus expressed the rankling feelings of his heart: 'Hopkins says that nothing was made in vain, and for what were you made?' At the same moment crushing them beneath his feet, he continued, 'There, that is what you were made for.' 'Yes,' said a voice within, which spoke the language of conscience, 'they were made to show forth the enmity of your heart against God.'

"While thus indulging feelings of opposition and bitterness against the government of God, and for righteousness' sake, against his brother Hopkins, the settlement of an estate, belonging to their wives' family, made it necessary for the brothers-in-law to have frequent intercourse with each other. At one of those meetings, Mr. Sanford indulged his rankling spirit by endeavoring to irritate his brother Hopkins. At length he succeeded. Mr. Hopkins left his brother's house in anger. To Mr. Sanford the irritation of Mr. Hopkins was a triumph. 'There,' said he to his wife, 'there goes your saintly brother. He professes to be a Christian, and is always insisting upon the necessity of a change of heart; see what a heart he has exhibited.' 'And,' said Mr. Sanford, when afterwards relating the circumstance, 'I felt that I had triumphed, and that was to me a night of joy. I had gained an advantage; my foot was on the neck of brother Hopkins, and I was determined to keep it there.' But next morning Mr. Hopkins called upon his brother at an early hour. 'I want to see your family together, brother Sanford.' When the family had assembled, he proceeded: 'Last evening I was angry; mine was not the spirit of the Gospel. I have done much to wound the cause of religion, and to prejudice you against it. I have had no sleep to-night, and I cannot hope to receive forgiveness of God until I have asked your forgiveness. Brother, will you forgive me? and O! do not form your opinion of religion from what you have seen of its influence in my example.' 'And,' said Mr. Sanford, 'as he left my house, his eye fell upon mine, and it pierced my heart. That placid look spoke of peace within, and of peace to which I was a stranger.'

"The conviction of an essential difference between his brother's affections and his own, which then fastened on the mind of Mr. Sanford, never left him, until he hoped that in a new and higher sense he could call his brother Hopkins, *brother*."

The other individual to whom we have alluded, as savingly blessed through the labors of Dr. Hopkins, was the Rev. Dr. West, late of Stockbridge.

"Mr., afterwards Dr. Stephen West, had entered the ministry, and settled in Stockbridge, while yet a stranger to experimental religion. Like other learned men, who are trusting to their own righteousness, he had labored to accommodate his theology and his preaching to his own standard of personal religion. Two pious females, members of his church, who had often lamented their want of spiritual instruction and benefit from the ministry of their pastor, at length agreed to meet, once a week, to pray for him. Amidst many discouragements, they continued their united supplications for their pastor to the Hearer and Answerer of prayer; but, as they afterwards remarked, they were never both discouraged at the same time. On leaving the house of God, one would say, 'We have had no food to-day.' The other's answer was usually in words of encouragement: 'God is able to do for us all that we ask; let us continue our meetings for prayer.' At length their prayers were heard; there was a sudden and remarkable change in the preaching of their pastor. They met as usual at the close of worship. 'What is this?' said one. 'God is the hearer of prayer,' answered the other. The means by which this change was effected

remain to be detailed. Mr. West and Mr. Hopkins were in the habit of meeting frequently, for the purpose of discussing their different views of divine truth. At those meetings, it was Mr. Hopkins' practice to allow Mr. West to state his views, and to exhaust his arguments, before attempting a reply; and then, in the kindest and clearest manner, to show their repugnance to the word of God. On one of these interviews, Mr. West, who had been walking the room in great agitation, turned to Mr. Hopkins, and said, 'Only reconcile divine sovereignty with man's agency, and I will give up my sentiments and embrace yours.' 'And cannot *you* reconcile them, Mr. West?' 'No,' said he, 'I cannot.' 'Well,' said Dr. Hopkins, with great mildness and sincerity, 'I have to your conviction proved that God is a sovereign; and you are conscious that man is a free agent; now, therefore, if you cannot reconcile God's sovereignty with man's agency, you *must* be damned.' Nor was the appeal in vain. The words, 'I must reconcile divine sovereignty with man's agency, or be damned,' continued day and night to dwell upon his mind. Conviction that he was a stranger to godliness, and a blind leader of the blind, fastened upon him. With great fearfulness and misgiving of heart, he continued to preach; but he preached practically, and according to that view of divine truth which then occupied his own mind; and although to himself the way appeared dark, it was that sermon which he first preached after his mind was awakened which filled the hearts of those praying females with gratitude and joy. So true it is, that the experience of Christians is a common experience; that although in the case of Mr. West, all was, in his own view, darkness, yet he could not preach according to the views of truth which he then entertained, without carrying conviction to the pious mind that a great and essential change had commenced in his heart."

Dr. Hopkins was one of the first men in this country who boldly set his face against the African slave trade, and engaged in systematic efforts for its suppression. He also possessed, in a high degree, (for the period in which he lived,) the true missionary spirit.

"This (the missionary) is an important and commendable work, and worthy to be pursued with increasing zeal and steady perseverance by all Christians, whatever difficulties, disappointments, and apparent discouragements may occur. And though the attempts should not be succeeded in the conversion of one heathen, yet they who honestly and from truly Christian principles engage in this cause, however much they risk or expend, and even if they lose their own lives in it, yet will really lose nothing by it, but meet with a rich reward. And if but a few souls be gathered to Christ and be saved, this will more than compensate for all the cost and pains that can be bestowed in the cause; for one soul is worth more than ten thousand worlds. And though Israel be not now gathered, and there shall be no great and remarkable success at present, yet they shall be acceptable in the eyes of the Lord, and it will in some way, though now unknown to us, serve to promote and hasten on the happy day when the heathen shall be given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

"In this view I rejoice when I am taking my leave of the world, and heartily wish success to all who *are*, (and within a few years an extraordinary zeal has been manifested on this subject both in Europe and America,) and the many more who *hereafter shall* be engaged in this glorious, happy work."

The Memoir before us should be welcomed, both as a deserved tribute to the memory of a great and good man, and also as a very seasonable and acceptable work. The life of Hopkins, properly speaking, was never before given to the public. A memoir, written by himself, was indeed published soon after his death; but, as Mr. Ferguson well observes, it "is Dr. Hopkins' *confession*, rather than his *biography*."

"He has introduced us into the secret recesses of his heart, and has made known his doubts, his discouragements, and his humiliating views of his own sinfulness. And to Christians who have drunk at the same fountain, and who have partaken of the same spirit, his is the language of a common experience.

"Still, there is another point of view in which we desire to contemplate his character. We naturally inquire, "Who is this, that thus calls in question his own good estate, and speaks of himself in terms of such lowliness and abasement? What were his life and character, when compared with those of other men?" And when these questions are satisfactorily answered, when we can obtain evidence that he was a man of eminent self-denial, of benevolence, of uprightness and usefulness, then, and not before, are we enabled to form an estimate of what Pollok calls "the great humble man."

7. *An Exhibition of Unitarianism; in Quotations from its Standard Authors and Works.* With Scriptural Extracts. Boston: Peirce and Williams, 1830. pp. 50.

The subject of this little work is sufficiently explained in the advertisement prefixed to it.

"The design of this tract is to exhibit Unitarianism, according to its latest transformations, not in the language of those who reject it, and who may be suspected of giving a coloring to the statement, but *in the words of those who hold it and teach it*. Not a few in this country who have heard much respecting Unitarianism, and whose minds may have been unsettled in regard to it, have not the means of knowing what it is. Its teachers have never been remarkable for their explicitness. They have maintained from the first a "cautious reserve;" have adopted, so far as possible, the phraseology of the Orthodox; and in some parts of Massachusetts, are endeavoring, at this moment, to make their people believe, that Unitarianism does not differ materially from the commonly received doctrine. It has been deemed important, therefore, to collect some of the opinions which from time to time have been expressed, and present them, in one view, for the satisfaction of the reader. The serious inquirer may thus see with his own eyes, and read in the words of Unitarians themselves, what they believe, and what they do not believe, on a variety of topics connected with the important subject of religion.

To the plan of the work, as here exhibited, there will be objections.

"It will be said, no doubt, that these are short sentences, separated from their connexion, and that nothing ought to be determined from them.—That the following work consists chiefly of detached sentences, is acknowledged. In what other mode could it have been compiled, without swelling what was intended to be a mere tract into a massy volume? The public may be assured, however, that the quotations are made fairly and truly, and with a design to express the *real sentiment* of the writer."

Another objection will be, that, admitting "the real sentiments" of the writers are given, they are but the sentiments of individuals, and ought not to be charged upon the whole Unitarian community.—But supposing they are the sentiments of Individuals; probably more than a hundred individuals are here quoted—the principal writers in the Unitarian world; and if the sentiments of the body cannot be learned from these, from what sources shall they ever be gathered? Besides, we would inquire of those who object to the sentiments of the periodicals and individuals here quoted, Are you not known as those who patronise these periodicals? and who extend to these individuals the hand of Christian fellowship? In these, and other ways, are you not daily manifesting that they have

your approbation? Complain not, then, that you are identified with them, and even held responsible, to some extent, for their opinions.

The work before us is divided into thirteen sections, with the following titles: Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures;—The Person and Character of Christ;—The Holy Spirit;—Human Depravity;—Regeneration;—Atonement;—Justification;—The Soul, Separate State, Resurrection, and the Judgement;—Of Angels, Fallen and Holy;—Future Punishment;—Positive Institutions;—Recreations and Amusements;—Miscellaneous Topics. Under the most of these heads, passages of Scripture are quoted and so arranged as to present Unitarianism and the Bible in strong contrast.

The following, which occurs under the head of "Recreations and Amusements," is from the pen of a "Unitarian Minister in England."

"Your correspondent would not have a dissenting minister employ any of his time at the *card-table*; and he argues upon this subject, as unhappily most people do when they have a mind to cry down a practice,"—"he argues from the abuse of the thing." "Do none but the profane and worthless frequent the card-table? To admit this, would be *illiberal indeed*." "I presume that if a dissenting minister plays at cards, it will not be with the worthless and profane, but perhaps with members of his own society."—"Your correspondent's argument seems to avow that a dissenting minister cannot play at cards without coveting his neighbor's goods. I grant he cannot be indifferent whether *he win or lose*; but really it is enough to make one laugh, when it is seriously argued that a *man playing twopenny or sixpenny points* is guilty of a breach of the tenth commandment."^{*}

The work before us was evidently compiled with great care and labor, and is offered for circulation in the cheap form of a tract. We cannot doubt that thousands of copies will be circulated.

8. *A Decade of Addresses, delivered from 1820 to 1829, to the Senior Classes at Bowdoin College; together with an Inaugural Address: To which is added a Dudleian Lecture, delivered May 12, 1830, at Harvard University.* By William Allen, D. D., President of Bowdoin College. Boston: Hilliard, Gray & Co. 1830. pp. 272.

9. *Essay on the Hieroglyphic System of M. Champollion, Jun., and on the Advantages which it offers to Sacred Criticism.* By J. G. H. Greppo, Vicar General of Belley. Translated from the French by Isaac Stuart, with Notes and Illustrations. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830. pp. 277.

10. *A Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims, and a Vindication of the Congregational Churches of New England.* By Joel Hawes, Pastor of the first church in Hartford. Hartford: Cooke & Co., and Packard & Butler. 1830. pp. 226.

11. *A Sermon preached in the Church in Brattle Square, Boston, August 1, 1830, the Lord's Day after the Decease of the Hon. Isaac Parker, Chief Justice of Massachusetts.* By John G. Palfrey, A. M., Pastor of the Church in Brattle Square. Boston: Nathan Hale, and Gray & Bowen. pp. 32.

* See Monthly Repository, vol. i. pp. 644—650.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

NOVEMBER, 1830.

NO. 11.

COMMUNICATIONS.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN CALVIN.

To no period, since the apostolic age, will the pious student of Ecclesiastical History recur with an interest so intense, as to the early part of the sixteenth century, when that mighty struggle began, which shook every pillar of the Papal throne, and resulted in the most glorious intellectual and spiritual emancipation, that the world had witnessed, for more than twelve hundred years. It was an emancipation of *reason* and of *conscience*, from a despotism, which, under the garb of religion, had sealed up the oracles of truth ; had closed "the wells of salvation ;" had daily been gathering new strength, and forging new chains for enslaved nations and prostrate minds, during all the dark ages. No one can question, that 'the excellency of the power' which finally broke these chains, and dispelled these delusions, was of God ; but, in the achievement of this great victory, He was pleased to employ human instrumentality. To accomplish his designs of mercy to the church, he raised up just such agents as the exigencies of the times demanded ; and who, since the apostles fell asleep, can be named, as having higher claims upon the gratitude of the world, than those Christian heroes, who stood foremost against the usurpations, corruptions and blasphemies of the "man of sin," and who "willingly hazarded their lives for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ?" In the annals of earthly glory, their names, indeed, may not be recorded ; but they will be embalmed in the hearts of emancipated millions, who, from age to age, will enjoy the full harvest of their labors, perils, and sufferings. Generations to come will do justice to their memory ; while *they* "will shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever."

In bringing about that surprising revolution, so appropriately

denominated the *Reformation*, Luther, Zuingle and Calvin, were the most honored instruments. We would on no account detract one iota from the reputation of Melancthon, Zanchius, Bucer, Knox, and more than thirty other mighty men, who distinguished themselves in those "wars of the Lord;" "howbeit they attained not unto the first three."

It would be interesting to follow the great German Reformer, through the numerous perils, toils and deliverances of his eventful life; and it is to be hoped, that ere long, some one will favor the public with such a sketch. I am now to invite attention to a somewhat lengthened biographical notice of *John Calvin*.

Let it not be imagined that this task is undertaken, under the impression that the reputation of Calvin stands in need of any new defence. His fame, like the summits of his adopted country, rests upon deep and broad foundations. When the memorial of his bitterest assailants, in both hemispheres, shall have passed away, the character and writings of this distinguished reformer will excite increasing admiration and gratitude, as they go down to future generations and to other times.

John Calvin was born at Noyon, in France, on the tenth day of July, 1509. He received the rudiments of his education in the family of a distinguished nobleman, named Mommor, with whose children, and by whose patronage, he was sent to the College of la Marche, in the city of Paris. In that Seminary, under the instruction of the learned Cordier, he laid the foundation of that thorough knowledge of the Latin language, which enabled him to surpass most of his cotemporaries in writing it with elegance and ease. From la Marche, young Calvin went to the College of Montaign, where he made uncommon proficiency, for his years, in various studies. Encouraged by the gravity of his deportment, and intending him for the priesthood in the Romish church, his father procured for him a benefice from the Bishop of Noyon, at the early age of *twelve* years.

From Montaign, Calvin returned to Paris, where, for several years he devoted himself, with no common ardour and success, to philosophy and polite literature. Receiving an additional benefice in 1527, and exchanging it two years after for a curacy in his native town, he seems to have preached occasionally in the latter place, until his father, flattered by his attainments and talents, recalled him from his preparations for the desk to the study of the civil law, in the university of Orleans.

This change in his studies was by no means agreeable to Calvin at first; but he soon distinguished himself so much in the University, that when a professor was occasionally absent, he was invited to fill the vacant chair. About this time, he became acquainted with his kinsman, Olivetan, from whom he first imbibed a taste for the true doctrines of religion. He now began to search the Scrip-

tures with great diligence ; and as light broke in upon his mind, he gradually withdrew himself from the Romish communion. So severe, about this time, was his application to study, so rich and various were his acquirements, and so high was the admiration of many for his talents and piety, that, though he earnestly sought retirement, such numbers thronged about him, that his study had the appearance almost of a public school.

From Orleans, Calvin was removed by his father to the University of Bourges, where he devoted himself to the Greek language, literature and religion under distinguished masters, and sometimes preached at Ligniers, a small town in the province of Berri. At the age of twenty two, he went to Paris ; and anticipating the persecutions which would be raised to suppress every incipient attempt to reform the abuses of the church, he prepared an elaborate commentary on Seneca's Epistle, *de Clementia*, hoping to impress on the mind of Francis I. the mild principles of that celebrated performance. This production, which he enriched by authorities and examples from the most distinguished classics of Greece and Rome, is pronounced by good judges to be a specimen of learning and eloquence, unrivalled as the production of so young a man. While at Paris, Calvin became acquainted with several persons of considerable distinction, who had begun to imbibe the doctrines of the reformation ; and his father being now dead, he laid aside the study of law, and devoted himself entirely to the cause of religion. Being soon suspected of heresy, his papers were seized by the officers of the inquisition, and he narrowly escaped their hands, through the protection and influence of the Queen of Navarre, who was the only sister of Francis. As the storm of persecution now began to rage fiercely in France, Calvin resolved to take a bold stand in favor of the reformation. In 1434, he publicly renounced fellowship with Rome and retired to Orleans, from whence, knowing that he could be safe nowhere in his native country, he retired to Basil in Switzerland. There, in 1535, he published the first edition of his justly admired *Institutes of the Christian religion*. After visiting and spending some little time in Italy, Calvin returned to settle his pecuniary concerns at Noyon, intending, as soon as this could be done, to retire again, either to Basil, or Strasburgh ; but his course was providentially turned to Geneva. At this place, where he purposed to sojourn but a single night, he was immediately made known to Farel, a bold and distinguished reformer, who first came to that city in 1532 ; and three years after, obtained in a full assembly of the people, the formal abolition of Papal authority, and the adoption of the worship and doctrines of the reformed churches. Farel was extremely anxious to detain Calvin at Geneva, but finding that he had determined to devote himself to study and retirement, and that he gained nothing by entreaties, he had recourse to the following strong language of imprecation :—" I declare to you, in the name of Al-

mighty God, that if, under the pretext of love to your studies, you refuse to unite your labors with ours in the work of the Lord, he will curse you in your retirement, as seeking your own will and not his." Calvin was awed by this denunciation. He tarried at Geneva, and was soon after chosen Pastor, and elected professor of sacred literature. Assisted by Farel and Coraud, he entered upon the duties of the pastoral office, and directed all his efforts to advance the purity and prosperity of the church. He drew up a formula of Christian doctrines, and also a short catechism, adapted to the circumstances of a people just emerging from the delusions of popery, which was adopted by the senate and people, on the 26th of July, 1537.

A few months previous to this important event, the Anabaptists made their appearance in Geneva, and, being abetted by the adherents of popery, threatened both the peace of the Church and the safety of the commonwealth. In a public disputation with Calvin and his colleagues, they were, however, so completely vanquished, that they left the city of their own accord, which was seldom afterwards visited by any of that people. But the doctrines of the reformation, in their scriptural purity and simplicity, were at this time far from being firmly established at Geneva. There was a powerful and growing faction, which greatly disturbed the order and obstructed the discipline of the church. By a concurrence of unfavorable circumstances, this faction ultimately gained the ascendancy, and obtained a decree against Calvin and his associates, Farel and Coraud, requiring them to leave the city within two days.

They departed, amidst the lamentations of their bereaved flock, and went directly to Zurich. Leaving Zurich, Calvin spent a short time in Basil, and then retired to Strasburg, where, freed from the obligations of his ministerial office, he renewed the resolution of retiring from all public duties, and devoting himself to his favorite studies. But Geneva was still destined, in the wise Providence of God, to be the theatre of his future labors; and by driving him into exile, his persecutors, though they "meant not so," contributed materially to prepare him for greater usefulness; as his faith was thereby tried and strenghtened, his experience enlarged, his acquaintance with other churches and Ministers was extended, and his subsequent authority and influence vastly promoted.

Calvin had not been long at Strasburgh, when he was drawn from his retirement, by being elected theological Professor in the college of that city; an office the duties of which he discharged with great applause. Yielding, also, to the solicitations of his friends, he resumed his ministerial functions, and had the happiness of gathering a French church in Strasburgh, upon the reformed basis of that at Geneva. In the welfare of this dear little flock of exiles, he felt a deep and fatherly interest, to the end of his life.

But to return to Geneva. Soon after the departure of Calvin and his associates, Cardinal Sadolet, availing himself of the unhappy divisions which rent the church, wrote an artful and conciliating letter to the council and senate, the object of which was, to bring the Genevese back to the bosom of Rome. How far this design, which was urged with great plausibility and eloquence, might have succeeded, had Calvin been ignorant of it, or remained silent, it is impossible to say ; but although that cruel decree, which drove him into banishment, was still in force against him, his bowels yearned over the very authors of it ; and in a prompt and dignified answer to Sadolet, he so clearly exposed his sophistry, and so fully unmasked the pollutions of popery, that the people were effectually put upon their guard against the insidious machinations of the Roman see.

While at Strasburg, our indefatigable reformer published a revised edition of the Institutes ; also an elaborate commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans, and a treatise upon the Lord's Supper, designed to allay the controversy then going on between the adherents of Luther and Zuingli, concerning *the real presence*. He was also present, as a delegate, at the imperial Synod of Frankfort in 1539, at the Diet of Worms in 1540, and at that which was convened at Ratisbon in 1541. While he was zealously engaged in these arduous and highly responsible duties, affairs took a decided turn in his favor at Geneva ; and he was earnestly desired by the senate and people to re-accept of the offices of Professor and Pastor in their city, from which he had been so unjustly expelled. At first, Calvin utterly declined ; and if he had been left to his own inclinations and the wishes of his friends in Germany, he would probably never have listened to the proposal. But the earnestness and perseverance of the Genevese, seconded by the judgement of Bucer and other distinguished reformers, finally prevailed. He yielded to a sense of duty ; and in September, 1541, returned to Geneva, where he was received with open arms and public thanksgiving to God, by the senate and people.

Calvin, whose mind was ever awake to favorable times and seasons, availed himself of the opportunity which this renewed confidence afforded, to introduce a system of doctrines and discipline, which he had drawn up with great care, and which he intended as a permanent standard of faith and government in the church. He succeeded, though not without opposition, and on the twentieth day of November, his revised system of ecclesiastical polity was adopted by the unanimous vote of the senate, and the consent of a great majority of the people.

It was about this time, that having carefully revised and enlarged his Catechism, he published it, both in French and Latin, as a compendious manual for the benefit of children and youth ; and so highly was this book esteemed by the pious and learned abroad, that it was translated into no less than seven languages, the Ger-

man, Dutch, English, Scotch, Spanish, Greek and Hebrew. Nor must I omit to add another testimonial in its favor, by that illustrious assembly of Divines at Westminster, who, more than a hundred years after it was written, adopted it as the model of their incomparable catechism.

In 1544, Calvin addressed a very interesting letter to the Pastors of Neufschatel on the subject of Church Discipline. The same year, and while the Diet at Spire was in session, which terminated so favorably to the Protestant cause, he published a work, entitled, *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*, in which he exposed the corruptions of popery, and defended the cause of the reformation with astonishing ability and effect.

At this time, he also published his *Instructions against the errors of the Anabaptists and Libertines*, in which he discusses the doctrines of divine sovereignty and human accountability, and strenuously denies, that God is the *criminal cause of evil, or author of sin*.*

In 1547, when the Protestant churches in Germany were greatly menaced by the decrees of the famous Council of Trent, Calvin published an "Antidote," in which he examined and replied to the iniquitous doings of that body with great energy and effect.

The next year, his active pen was successfully employed in unmasking the hypocrisy of Charles the V., in that insidious Formula, called the *Interim*, and in demonstrating its tendency to subvert the foundation of the Protestant cause. During the same year, also, and amidst the vexatious factions of his own church, Calvin, as though surrounded by a perfect calm, completed and published his learned Commentaries on the epistles, besides a small and elegantly written work against judicial Astrology.

Thus, to sum up in a few words what might be spread over many pages, deeply intent as Calvin was upon the interests of the Genevan church, arduous as were the duties of his professorship, and perilous as were the struggles which he had to maintain at home with successive calumniators, heresiarchs and factions, in defence of Gospel truth and Gospel order, he found time and means to render the most important services to the other churches of Switzerland, and to the sacred cause of the reformation in France, Bohemia, Poland, Germany, England and Scotland. Besides the more important works which we have already mentioned, he wrote and circulated many able and useful sermons, apologies, and smaller tracts; maintained an active correspondence with most of the principal reformers of his time; assisted them in forming articles of faith and discipline for their respective churches; and always stood ready to repel every attack, whether secret or

* *Nego Deum esse mali autorem. And again, Neque tamen malorum author sit Deus. See his Exposition of Acts II. 23. Also his book on Predestination.*

open, which might be made upon the walls of Zion. By his courage, vigilance, talents and piety, under the blessing of God, he triumphed over all the arts of domestic faction ; and when most of the reformed churches upon the continent were threatened with extermination, by the hostile elements which were set in mighty array around them, by the Pope on one side, and the Emperor on the other ; and when such men as Bucer and Melancthon were borne down with anguish in view of the gathering storm ; the soul of Calvin, while he sympathized in their sorrows, was still undismayed in the midst of all these dangers and convulsions. "Firm as the rocks of his country," says a faithful memorialist, "and with views far more elevated than her mountains afford, he looked abroad over all the darkness of Pontifical impiety and imperial ambition, which, like the clouds of morning mist winding around their tops, transiently dissolved before the visions of faith, and passed away beneath the light of the promises and the providence of the Redeemer."

But we must hasten forward, that we may enjoy a few moments with this extraordinary man, in the closing scenes of his life. As his bodily infirmities increased to such a degree, that he was compelled to relinquish his public duties, his vigorous and active mind seemed still to be gathering new and holier energy, and the nearer he approached the goal of immortality, the more unremitting, if possible, were his studies. "When confined to his bed, oppressed with the head ache, weakness of the bowels, and pains of the gout, he would dictate letters, treatises and commentaries, till his amanuensis was wearied."

He was able to attend the *Consistory*, on the 24th of March, which afforded him great satisfaction. Three days after, he was carried to the door of the Council-house, and being led into the chamber, he thanked the senate for all their kindness, and especially for the proofs of affection which they had shown him, during his present illness. His speech failed, and he left the senators all in tears. On the second of April, he was carried to the house of worship in an easy chair. He heard the sermon before the Lord's Supper, received the elements from the hand of Beza, and with a trembling voice joined the congregation in a hymn, while his pale countenance was lighted up with a holy and heavenly serenity.

I hardly know anything more touching than his last address to the Syndics and Senators of Geneva, who assembled at his house on the twenty sixth of April, to receive his parting advice and dying benediction.

"I have long," said he "wished for a conference with you, but have deferred it, till I was more certainly assured of the near approach of death. I return you thanks, my highly honored Lords, for having distinguished me with so many honors, which I have

by no means deserved, and for bearing so patiently with my many infirmities. I earnestly beseech you, that if, in anything, I have not performed my duty as I ought, you will ascribe it to my inability and not to my disposition. I assure you, that I have always taken a deep interest in the welfare of this Republic; but I must entreat you to pardon me, that I have effected so little in my public and private capacity, in comparison with what I ought to have done.

As for the doctrines which you have heard from me, I testify to you, that I have not rashly nor uncertainly, but purely and sincerely taught the word entrusted to me of God, knowing that otherwise his indignation would already hang suspended over my head; but now I am confident that my labors in the ministry have not been displeasing to Him. I make this declaration in the presence of God, and before you the more willingly, as I have no doubt that Satan, after his usual manner, will raise up many vain, dishonest and giddy minded men, to corrupt the pure doctrines which you have heard from me."

Then, having exhorted them in many words, still to hope and trust in God, to keep his commandments, to live in peace, to execute judgement and justice, to watch against evil passions, and firmly to resist all temptations, he fervently commended them to God in prayer, imploring for them the gifts and guidance of the Holy Spirit in all their official duties, and then affectionately giving each of them his right hand, he bade them all farewell. They parted from him with tears as from a common father.

His address to the ministers of Geneva, who were assembled in his room two days after, was worthy of the man, and of the occasion. He exhorted them to continue faithful in their work after his decease; expressed to them his strong confidence, that God would preserve both the Republic and Church against all the threats of their enemies; exhorted them to put away all divisions, and embrace one another with mutual charity, to consider what they owed to God and the church, and to hold fast the doctrines and discipline which he considered indispensable to the prosperity of true religion. Having thus given them what he thought to be his dying charge, he expressed his satisfaction that he had always lived with them in the sincere bonds of charity; asked their forgiveness, if he had in the course of his sickness, manifested anything like a morose disposition; and thanked them for discharging the duties of his office during his confinement.

On the 19th of May, the life of Calvin being still prolonged, the ministers assembled once more at his house, to partake of the accustomed meal in token of friendship, the week preceding the administration of the Lord's supper. As he approached the table with much difficulty, he said, "*I am come my brethren to sit with you for the last time at this table.*" The scene affected them very

deeply. He offered the prayer, ate a little, and conversed cheerfully. But before the repast was ended, he said, with a serene and pleasant countenance, *I must be carried to my bed ; these walls will not prevent my union with you in spirit, although my body be absent.* He was accordingly carried back to his bed, to rise no more. He lingered till the 27th of May, 1665, when in the “ full possession of his reason, without a struggle or a gasp, his breath ceased, and the spirit of this great doctrinal luminary of the reformation departed, about the going down of the sun.” He died in the fifty sixth year of his age, and the 29th of his ministry.

(To be Continued)

THE BENEFITS OF SYSTEM IN OUR RELIGIOUS CHARITIES.

A system of charity may be established by individuals for *themselves* alone ; or by individuals *associated together* with a view to advance important objects. Individuals may establish a system of charity for themselves, by resolving to bestow a particular sum, every *week*. Thus the brethren, in the apostles' time, were directed to lay something by in store every Lord's day. And many, in modern times, have agreed to bestow a small sum every week in religious charity. Or individuals may resolve to bestow, steadily, a particular *proportion* of their regular income. Numbers now living bestow a *tenth* of all their income, for objects connected with the general diffusion of the gospel. Persons may establish a system of charity, by resolving to bestow a particular sum, or a particular proportion of their gains every *month*. Many in this way have made the contributions at the Monthly Concert, the medium of performing a regular course of religious charitable operations. Or persons may establish a system of charity, by resolving to bestow a particular sum every *year*. This mode of giving is at present so common, as to need no illustration.

Individuals, who are about establishing either of these systems of charity for themselves, may associate with others who are willing to do the same, and thus a regular charitable *Society* will be constituted. Where several of these societies exist in one vicinity, they may connect themselves together by a mutual agreement, and pour their united streams of charity into the treasury of the Lord. And where an object of great and common interest is presented, sufficient to excite a whole *community*, the whole may be divided into associations of this nature, and thus a general system of religious charity may be organized.

These remarks are intended to show what is meant by a system

of charity. I proceed now to point out some of the *benefits* of system, in our religious charitable operations. And,

1. More will in this way be given, and with less embarrassment, than could be obtained by any other means. Little sums, regularly laid by in store, accumulate almost insensibly, and soon swell to a considerable amount. A few cents every week amount to *dollars* in the course of a year. Or a small proportion of the *gains* of any person, who is in flourishing circumstances, reserved steadily for charitable purposes, would in a little time amount to a sum that would probably surprise him. "A number of persons in the city of Boston engaged years ago to contribute a *dollar*, at every Monthly Concert; and they fulfilled their engagement." And it is on this account, chiefly, that the contributions at the Monthly Concert in Boston have been more regular, and more productive, than perhaps at any other place. A gentleman, of whom I have read, "commenced business with very moderate prospects." He determined to set apart a certain proportion of every gain, to be sacredly "devoted to the service of God." And by this means he was enabled to support wholly, for some part of the time, and to assist constantly "in the support of an aged disciple" of Christ; "to contribute a weekly stipend for a poor and wretched family;" and in the course of six months to contribute *fifteen dollars* for the promotion of the general cause of religion. These instances, out of the many which might be mentioned, show how greatly and almost insensibly little sums, laid by for charitable purposes, increase; and make it evident, that by bestowing our charities according to system, more will be given, and with less embarrassment, than could be obtained in any other way.

2. By bestowing our charities in this way, we shall be likely to *save* as much as we give. This may seem paradoxical as first; but both experience and reflection show it to be true. The gentleman referred to under the last particular, who, by devoting a certain proportion of his gains to charitable purposes, was enabled to accomplish so much good, adds, "I have no doubt that the deductions made on every gain, have been *saved* in carefulness and economy." It cannot be doubted, I think, that they were; and that every person who should make the experiment, would come to the same result. He would find, that a systematical and consistent course of charitable operations would be a means of saving him as much as he bestowed. There are good reasons why it should be so. First of all, he would, if under a proper influence, secure for himself "the *blessing of God* which maketh rich," and which God has promised to bestow upon the consistently liberal. And besides; "whoever adopts a system, with respect to his charities, will be likely to do his other business systematically. Whoever is conscientious and exact in complying with charitable claims upon him, will be so in his other concerns; and this will lead to the truest and best economy. He who devotes one part of every gain to promote the cause of God in the world, will not be

inclined to spend the other part thoughtlessly, extravagantly, or wickedly. The bare fact of bestowing charity, provided it result from a proper motive, must have a moral influence on the heart, which will be felt and exhibited in the whole manner of living. And if these acts of Christian charity are carried into the common business of life, and multiplied to the number of any person's gains, they must so bring into view, and hold up before the mind, the Gospel motives and rules of purity, honesty, and active diligence, as greatly to prevent poverty, and the numberless disappointments in pecuniary concerns, to which all men are liable." Such are some of the reasons which will satisfy every reflecting person, that by forming and pursuing a wise and proper system of religious charity, we shall actually *save* as much as we give. Our system of charity will probably be more a *gain* to us, than a loss.

3. If the charities of the Christian public are bestowed regularly and systematically, they can be *expended* to much better advantage. Every person, at all acquainted with business, knows, to how much better purpose he can employ his means, if he has them in his own hands, or if he has the means of knowing what they are, and at what time he may expect them, than though he is left, on these subjects, in suspense and uncertainty. Every such person will see, therefore, to how much greater advantage the charities of the Christian public may be expended and applied, if they are bestowed according to some regular system. Those to whom they are entrusted, knowing very nearly what sums they are to expect, and when to expect them, will be able to form their plans with wisdom and foresight. They will be able to take the advantage of opportunities and circumstances, and to turn the means entrusted to them to the best account.

4. The friends of religious charity, by being associated and organized according to some general system, will inspire *mutual confidence and strength*. The work of diffusing the Gospel is one of great labor and difficulty; and were any individual engaged in it alone, or with only a few to countenance and assist him, he would be likely to be soon discouraged. Or were there numbers engaged in it, but all laboring separately, without plan or union, the strength and confidence, which they might mutually impart, would be much diminished. But when the great work of religious charity is undertaken systematically—when its friends and promoters become regularly organized—each moving in his proper sphere, and doing his own work; then they will appear and feel like the army of the Lord of hosts, will inspire mutual confidence and strength, and the noble work, in which they are engaged, will go forward with a steady and resistless progress.

5. System, among the friends and supporters of Missions, will serve to give confidence to the *Missionaries* themselves. Those beloved brethren and sisters, who have left their friends and homes

and perhaps their country, for the purpose of spreading the gospel among the heathen, are, under God, dependent on the churches and Christians whom they have left behind. And this dependence they must deeply feel. They feel that they are but the messengers of the churches, and can do little more than these churches, by their contributions, shall enable them to accomplish. With what interest, therefore, must they look to the contributions of the churches? And with what confidence it must inspire them in their arduous work, to find their brethren at home not only remembering them with affection and prayer, but establishing for their benefit a great and general system of religious charitable operation, through which the means of their usefulness are to be regularly supplied, and the donations of the churches are to flow out in one continual and unbroken stream. Perceiving that, by such a measure, their earthly foundation is much strengthened, and their prospects of permanent usefulness increased; they will be encouraged to enlarge the sphere of their labors, to form and to execute new plans of benevolence, and to make longer and greater inroads upon the territory of the enemy of souls.

6. The friends and promoters of religious charity, by being systematically organized can be more directly addressed—can be made more *minutely acquainted* with circumstances—and their united strength can be more *readily called forth*, when special emergencies require it. If insulated or unconnected in their exertions, they will have no common centre of information and interest, and no individual among them will be able to make his voice heard, beyond the little circle in which he separately moves. But if their operations become digested into a regular system, their case will be much altered, and improved. They then can be addressed, directly and at once, on any subject or occasion which is thought necessary. They can be made acquainted with the same facts, the same plans, the same encouragements and wants. The same calls can be issued, and the same motives be made to bear, on all at once. The promoters of religious charity would resemble, in this case, a well regulated army, moving steadily onward to their purpose, and directing their united energies against the enemies of their Lord, in sure and certain prospect of a speedy and decisive victory.

7. A regular system of charitable operations would do away in great measure the necessity of special efforts.—Hitherto, the cause of religious charity has been sustained too much by efforts of this nature. A particular branch continues its expenditures, till it is brought into straits, perhaps to the borders of bankruptcy, when a vigorous and strained effort is made for its relief. From the several departments, these efforts follow each other, perhaps in quick succession, till the purses if not the patience of some good people are nearly exhausted. The times may have demanded efforts

such as these, and may still demand them; but they obviously ought to occur as seldom as possible. They are attended with danger to the cause, and in some instances have resulted in more harm than good. But how shall they be dispensed with, and still the good work be carried on, unless the whole be resolved into a regular systematic operation? Let every object have its place, and its time, when its claims shall be promptly met and answered, and special efforts may at once cease. The great moral machinery will move on without them, and without that danger from irregular shocks and disturbances to which they are now too frequently subjected.

8. By bestowing our charities according to system, they will be much more likely to be *continued*, and to be *permanent*. Without some regular digested system, Christians are liable to become careless and negligent in their contributions. Other calls are made, and are heeded, while the claims of the Lord's treasury are forgotten or disregarded. This accounts for it, that where there is no *system* of religious charity, the contributions are so fluctuating, and so little to be depended on. But when the charities of Christians are reduced to a system, there is more reason to hope they will be regular and permanent. The system established, if it be entered into with zeal and spirit, may be expected to move on in its appointed course. The stream of charity may be expected to run. Like the operations of nature, these benevolent operations will be steady and unfailing. The contributions of Christians may be expected to be continued, and so far as practicable, to be increased. In this way, the work of spreading the Gospel may be expected to cease, only when the necessity for it ceases. It may be expected to go forward, with increasing energy and success, till "the knowledge of the Lord shall have covered the earth as the waters do the sea."

I have here noticed several *advantages* which may be expected to result, from reducing the charities of the Christian public as much as possible to a system. They are, in the general, obvious, and such as can scarcely fail to be realized. In most *other* things, the advantages of system are universally acknowledged. But there is perhaps nothing to which system may be better applied, and from which the benefits of it will be greater, than the religious charitable operations of the present day.

It is to be hoped that this subject is beginning to be appreciated, and that the charitable operations of the day are gradually resolving themselves, more and more, into a regular, systematical form. Benevolent individuals are uniting themselves with others of a kindred spirit; smaller associations are combining their efforts, and constituting larger ones; while these are conveying the collected treasures of their charity to some greater and more general institution. By this means, the Christian community are coming

to act in union and concert, in promoting some of the noblest objects, which were ever presented to the mind of man. They are combining their efforts in one vast enterprise, to spread the religion of their Saviour, and to make known his Gospel to every creature. The Lord grant, that every attempt to systematize the charities of Christians may be productive of all those advantages which have been brought into view.

Let every reader regard himself as *bound* to engage personally and zealously in that grand system of religious charity which is at present going into operation. There is a station provided for every helper. There is something for each of us to do. And it will be a comfort to us, when we come to die, to reflect that we have stood in our lot, and done what we *could*, for the cause of our Saviour. And when millennial scenes are ushered in, it will be an *honor* to us to be remembered, as those who have prayed and labored to advance them. Our children will then love to say, one to another, "These are the glorious things, on which the hearts and hopes of our fathers and mothers were fixed—for which they prayed with many tears—and for which they cheerfully contributed of their store." Such a reflection will be of more value to our children than an estate! They will choose rather to be known, as the descendants of those who have devoted themselves and their substance to the cause of God, than of those, who have amassed for them an earthly treasure.

THE COMPARATIVE IMPORTANCE OF MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE.

It is somewhat remarkable, that with all the attention which the subject of education has received, those institutions which have made the highest professions in this department of human culture, and which have actually accomplished most in the developement of mind, have in some instances done least in the developement and right formation of the moral affections. In the culture of intellect, it seems to have been forgotten that man has a heart—a heart susceptible of being formed into a beauty and grandeur of character, of which many appear to have little conception. Such have been the disadvantages of education, in consequence of this neglect, that the best specimens of human character, as formed through the instrumentality of human cultivation, have been rare and isolated. In the successive ages of the world, there are, indeed, some distinguished and prominent examples of human excellence, both in knowledge and in virtue. But the most distinguished

knowledge has too often been unaccompanied with virtue ; and the highest virtue has too often wanted the embellishments of knowledge. A beautiful symmetry of intellect and character is rarely to be found. And, indeed, such examples could hardly be expected, so long as the appropriate means of forming them are not employed.

The cultivation of intellect is by no means to be depreciated. But intellectual acquisitions, without corresponding attainments in virtue to regulate and employ them, have too often furnished occasion for the poet's affecting description of the prostitution of such endowments :

"Talents, angel-bright,
If wanting worth, are shining instruments
In false Ambition's hand, to finish faults
Illustrious, and give Infamy renown."

Parents seem to be gifted by nature for early cultivating the affections of their children. The mother begins with her infant in her bosom. By her looks, and smiles, and incessant caresses, by every fond artifice which affection can invent, she awakens and calls into action the dormant affections in the bosom of her infant. Affection responds to affection ; the love of the parent calls forth the love of the child. And that is the most happy mother, who learns, by such a preparation on the basis of affection, to make her lessons of instruction a delight to her offspring. The child begins to *feel*, before it begins to *learn*. Knowledge creeps into the soul through the medium of affection. And happy is that parent, or instructor, who shall never leave his pupil to feel that his lesson is a task.

Here, between the mother and the nurseling in her arms, may be found the grand secret, the true charm of education. And it would be well, if the grave professors of the higher schools, of *colleges* even, would come down, and sit, and take lessons here, and mark well this infantile process of acquiring knowledge. The enticements and blandishments of affection, which beam from the eye and from every visible feature of the parent, awakening corresponding emotions in the bosom of the child, make the attainment of every new idea a delight. The liveliness of affection invigorates thought, suggests new trains of thought, and promotes inquiry ; and by this delightful process the mind may be led on, from one branch and from one degree of knowledge to another, insensible of labor and fatigue. The idea I wish to impress is this : that moral culture, or the culture of the affections, should, if I may so speak, create a *soil*, in which the seeds of knowledge are to be implanted, and by the constant cultivation of which, knowledge is to be raised to maturity, and to the production of fruit. It is such a state of the heart which makes knowledge precious, incorporates it with the soul, and identifies enjoyment with proficiency. Moral excellence

should constitute the basis, the soil, of every intellectual acquisition. Virtue is the proper ballast of knowledge; and the latter is a dangerous possession without the former.

But what shall the instructor assume, as the grand *instrument* of cultivating the heart? Where shall he look for the purest principles, by which to guide himself, and to form the growing affections of his pupil? I answer—to the word of God.

There is not a necessity, in the wide range of moral culture, from the earliest period of existence up to manhood,—and even down to the latest descent into the grave,—but a rule for it, and the best one possible, may be found in the Bible. Every movement of affection, with which the fond mother bends over her infant offspring, has something to promote and direct it on the sacred page. Every tender tie, that binds the parent to the child, and the child to the parent, in every successive period of life, is nourished and fostered there. Not a single virtuous feeling can spring up in the human heart in any period of human life, in any relation to God or man, but it has a counterpart, a delineation in the Bible. Everything that man should be, and do, is there defined. And this is the only proper, the only adequate rule, for the safest and highest culture of the affections.

And here it is important to observe, there is such a thing as going to the Scriptures in an improper way. It is not uncommon to take the *morality* of the Bible as a guide in moral culture, and neglect its *religion*; or to cultivate the principles of morality between man and man, all those virtues of heart and accomplishments of manners, which grow out of such principles; and yet neglect entirely the cultivation of those principles, which define the relations and obligations between God and man. In doing this, it may indeed be said, with some show of truth, that we take the Bible for a guide; but we take it in an improper way. We take it, not as it is set before us by its all-wise and benevolent Author. The Bible should be taken as a *whole*; and who does not know, that it is emphatically a book of religion? that religion is its grand subject, its body, its soul? It reveals God, and asserts its claims as coming from God. It records the primitive, and attests the apostate character of man. It discloses a long series of dispensations preparatory to the opening of a remedial system. It announces the birth of a Saviour, reveals his character, records his acts, his sufferings and atoning death, and attests his mediatorial offices in heaven. It makes the whole economy of Providence here on earth, and its own entire volume of inspiration, to cluster around the Saviour, as a grand luminary, a central point of attraction and effulgence, for whom, and for the objects of whose kingdom, this world is permitted to stand, and the Bible itself has been revealed. It opens the doctrine of repentance and faith, as the only possible law of the sinner's salvation; so that whatever virtue he may have,

without repentance it will be of no avail ; and whatever works of righteousness he may have wrought out by any other law than that of faith, it will answer him no purpose in the day of his trial. The Bible asserts the claims of Jehovah for the recovery of the alienated affections of the sinner, through Jesus Christ. It makes this demand, as the first duty which the sinner can render to God with acceptance ; as a duty without which he can never be properly qualified for any other.

It is religion, therefore, which constitutes the primary and grand topic of the Bible. Religion is the errand on which these sacred pages come to us from God. They are all clad and filled with the subject of religion. This is inscribed upon their front, and gives life, and soul, and consequence to the whole system of revelation.

But what sort of religion is that of which we have been speaking, and which the Bible reveals ? It is not a religion for creatures who dwell in heaven, and need no repentance ;—but for man in his fallen state—for *sinners*. It is a religion which demands of every individual to whom it comes, to begin the work with himself, *as a sinner*. The first acts and first duties required of him are, to renew his allegiance to God by repentance, and to secure his title to favor and acceptance by faith. If he does not begin here, he can do nothing which will be accepted.

If we do not use the Bible for the purpose for which it was given, we virtually reject and deny it. It cannot otherwise be the means of spiritual purification. We might as well scatter the drops of rain upon the ocean to freshen it, or the snow upon the surface of a bitter fountain to make it sweet. The saltness and the bitterness would still be there. Just so it is, in bringing the *morality* of the Bible to the human heart, without its religion. The deep depravity within remains unsubdued, and is only modified as to the form of its exhibition.

Believing this, and deeply solicitous for the highest good of those committed to his charge, the wise instructor will watch with a steady and a prayerful eye over their dispositions in regard to religion. He will feel, too, habitually, that the most important object of education is unattained, so long as the heart remains unsubdued by the saving power of evangelical truth.

ANTIPAS.

REVIEWS.

DYSPEPSY FORESTALLED AND RESISTED : *or Lectures on Diet, Regimen, and Employment. Delivered to the Students of Amherst College.* BY EDWARD HITCHCOCK, *Professor of Chemistry and Natural History.* Amherst : J. S. & C. Adams. pp. 360.

Every body now-a-days knows that something besides medicine is necessary for the prevention and cure of dyspepsia ; and almost every body who has suffered, or thinks he has suffered, or fears that he shall suffer, from this malady, has some notion about a course of diet or regimen which he regards as a specific cure for it. Unhappily the disease continues, notwithstanding the multitude of remedies at every body's hand ; and perhaps has never prevailed more extensively among all classes of people than it does at the present day.

The difficulty, which is inherent in the very nature of the case is, that the human body is not a mere mechanical apparatus, capable of being regulated by fixed principles and arbitrary laws. A man may eat by rule, if he pleases, and drink by rule, and walk by rule, and sit by rule, and study by rule, and sleep by rule ; but the stomach will not digest by rule. Accordingly we find, almost without exception, that the man who constantly aims at directing his diet and regimen by fixed rules, is overwhelmed with dyspepsia. When we see a man (what we often do see) asking if this be wholesome, or that unwholesome, if this is good for the bile, or that bad for the stomach, instead of receiving the good gifts of a kind Providence with cheerful thankfulness, we may regard it as settled, that he is either a confirmed dyspeptic, or far advanced in the way to become one. In truth, the dyspeptic as really wanders from his duty as the epicure, when he so anxiously asks, "What shall I eat ; and what shall I drink ?" And the answer, if it may be so applied, (as we trust it may without offence,) may with propriety be addressed to almost every man who has any tolerable pretensions to health, 'Eat what is set before you, asking no questions.' So long as invalids will go to tea with a pocket-full of dyspepsia bread, or to dinner with a store of mutton chops, (and we are not *imagining* cases which have not occurred,) for fear that the fare of their host will not be sufficiently homely for their morbid stomachs, so long we shall have no lack of invalids. The importance of the matter of eating and drinking is thus as truly overrated by the dyspeptic as by the epicure ; but with this difference in the result, that while the latter obtains, in some degree, the pleasure which is the object of his pursuit, the former cuts himself off from that rational enjoyment, with which it is the obvious design

of the Creator that his creatures should receive his bounty. We will not say which course is the most injurious to health ; because where both are wrong, it is not necessary to compare the evils resulting from them. We will only remark, that while, on the one hand, a devotion to the pleasures of the table, for the sake of those pleasures, is most debasing to the moral character, and destructive to health, on the other hand, it should not be forgotten, that a temperate and proper use of food is, by the very constitution of our bodies, necessarily accompanied by sensations of pleasure. And this pleasure is not only essential to the cheerfulness that makes a part of the thankful recognition of the goodness of the Giver of all our good things, with which a Christian receives the bounties of Providence, but is indispensable also to a sound digestion.

Shall every individual then be left to the unrestrained indulgence of his appetites, without any guidance or direction as to the extent to which their gratification may be useful or safe ? Far from it ;—although we are not quite sure that even this were not better, so far as health alone is concerned, than the rule-making and rule-breaking system which prevails so much at the present day. But we are not driven to the adoption of either alternative. *The remedy is a simple one.* There are in this, as in every other line of conduct, a few general principles, which it is easy for every man in health to adopt, and which, if he adheres to them with tolerable regularity, soon become matters of habitual practice, without either thought or care about them. There is the same difference between such a course, and living by rules which are to be ever present to the mind, that there is between the condition of a well regulated community and that of an arbitrary despotism. The good citizen, in a community like ours, feels himself as free, in all the common actions of life, while he is strictly conforming to the laws of the land, as if no laws were in existence ; but the subject of a despot is often made to feel the weight of arbitrary authority in matters, of themselves, of little moment.

We have said that our remedy is simple and easy of application. It is so to those who live for any of the real purposes of life. He who lives only that he *may live*, whether it be the epicure, who seeks only to gratify his appetite, or the dyspeptic, who studies only to preserve his health, will find it too simple for his purpose. It will afford too little occupation for his thoughts, to feed the sensual anticipations and reflections of the one, or the self-denying, self-sacrificing spirit of the other. It supposes, too, that the individual who applies it is in tolerable health. “They that are sick have need of the physician.” It is as vain, and is more difficult, for a sick man to undertake to direct the course of his diet, than it is for him to prescribe his own medicines.

The plan here suggested supposes some knowledge of those general principles to which we have alluded. The common sense of most men were quite sufficient for this purpose, were it not for the abundance of what may be called false-knowledge, which has gone forth in the world. Where everybody is so wise, a little *teaching* becomes necessary ;—and this is what is given in the work before us. The author does not, it is true, draw the line so strongly as we have done, between the general principles which should govern a man's conduct, and a system of rules to apply to his every-day actions ; indeed, he seems to us to have rather a fondness for specific rules. But his Lectures are addressed to young men, who, if they follow his directions enough to imbibe the principles upon which they are founded, may easily forget the rules themselves.

These Lectures were delivered to the students of Amherst College, during the last spring term, and were passed immediately through the press, very nearly, it should seem, as they were delivered. We think this haste is to be regretted. For although the author disdains any very anxious desire to satisfy the expectations of "the professed critic," we trust he would not regard it unworthy his attention to render his work, in its style and address, as well as in matter, acceptable to all classes of readers. There is a colloquial style of writing, which may appear very well in a lecture, and even add force and vivacity to the subject, which, when the work is printed and read by others, becomes offensive to good taste. We feel constrained to say, there is not a little of this in the lectures before us. The title itself is not remarkable, either for its good taste, or the modesty of its pretensions. But we pass these things by, as matters that may easily be corrected in a future edition.

The basis upon which all the rules of our author in respect to *diet* are founded, is a rigid observance of temperance, both in eating and drinking. In this, we must heartily concur with him. And generally, in regard to the rules themselves we should be ready to agree with him, although we should not be equally ready to assent to all the remarks by which their observance is recommended.

In his earnestness to enforce the importance of temperance, we think the author sometimes over-estimates the magnitude and extent of the evils, arising from an excess in eating ; (those from drinking spirits can hardly be over-estimated.) For example he says :—

"God has so constituted the human frame, that if properly treated, it will endure to old age, and rarely, if ever, be subject to the attacks of disease. Disease, in most cases, is the consequence of intemperance in diet. A man dies of a fever, or of apoplexy, or other violent disorders, and men generally consider it as his unavoidable fate ; whereas, in the majority of instances, it is the consequence of long continued excess in diet. Had the man followed the rigid rules on this subject, which experience has pointed out, probably he would have escaped the acute disease that ended his days, and in extreme old age, have sunk in mere decay."

That much of the disease which physicians have to contend with, and patients to suffer, is produced by excesses in diet will not be denied; but it surely requires no argument to show, that not all, or nearly all, is thus produced; that human institutions have not so perverted the designs of God's Providence, as to change the whole race of mankind from a healthy vigorous state, sinking into the grave only "in extreme old age," to their present liability to sickness and death, at every period, in infancy, in childhood, in youth, as well as in vigorous adult age, and in the decline of life.

The author has been misled by his medical authorities. He quotes indeed from those of high name and distinguished merit. But he is not aware, (and who but a physician can be fully aware?) how great deductions must be made from the statements and opinions of most medical writers, especially where their observations flow from the summit of some favorite theory. The same thing would probably hold true in the other professions. But be that as it may, in medical science, scarcely an opinion or a statement can be imagined so extravagant, that authority may not be found for it in the writings of men of high name. Most of these indeed are to be sought in the darker periods of human knowledge. But in our own day, ingenious men love to theorize; and the love of theory accumulates facts always on one side of a question only.

Besides, our author occasionally bestrides his pegasus himself; and when fairly mounted, he skims along with a velocity which obscures a little the distinctness of his perception. Successive objects strike his view with such rapidity that the spaces between them are overlooked. We know not how else he finds so much good eating in the world; although he finds medical authority for the opinion, which he quotes repeatedly with approbation, "that almost every man, woman, and child, in this country, habitually eats and drinks twice as much every day, on a moderate estimate, as is necessary." We do not, indeed, profess to have watched very minutely the mode of living of our neighbors, and therefore would not speak too confidently on this subject. But our avocations sometimes lead us into other people's houses at the hours of meals; and truly our country friends far exceed their city brethren in luxurious living, if the following is not a somewhat exaggerated description of the ordinary diet of "literary and religious men." The example is selected from those of "the latter description," [religious men,] "who are considered temperate and respectable," and is given as "the ordinary fare of such a family for one day."

"Probably a majority of sedentary and literary men among us make use of meat for breakfast; and generally of two kinds. Accompanying this, there must be bread and potatoes, salt, pepper, pickles, and sometimes eggs, &c. In addition to these, there must be toast or warm cakes, or biscuit and butter, and cheese. At dinner, there are usually two sorts of meat, accompanied by bread, potatoes, gravies, pickles, and various other vegetables and condiments. After this comes a pudding; then bread, cheese, and butter, at least; or if not a pud-

ding, bread, cheese, butter and pie ; and not unfrequently some kind of fruit closes the repast. At supper there must be bread, or biscuit, cheese, and butter, and generally preserves, with the addition of some kind of cake, or pie, and sometimes both."

"When the same family invite their friends to dine, or sup with them, there must be an addition to the dinner, of at least a third kind of meat, and one or two other pies, custards, &c. To the supper there must be added dried beef, or beef's tongue, pastry, preserves, custards, and two or three kinds of cake,—the loaf cake—the pound cake—the sponge cake, &c.—of all things the most unfit to put into a sedentary person's mouth. Not long after tea—which must also be so unreasonably strong as to produce wakefulness through the best part of the night, there come other temptations in the form of fruits, nuts, jellies, trifles, &c. And we must recollect, also, that it is the general custom of the guests, on such occasions, to partake of a portion at least, of nearly every variety of food and drink that is here presented to them."

"I say nothing here of those extensive and ridiculous fashionable parties among the gay and worldly minded, where the chief object seems to be to exclude common sense and prudence, and to do all that is possible, by food, drink and folly, to ruin the health and the morals : but I speak of the manner in which many temperate men of public education—many professors of religion, many ministers of the Gospel, live nearly every day—and of the manner in which they are wont to entertain their friends, when they invite them to a common social entertainment."

We cannot but suspect that professor H. has mistaken the expressions of kindness of some of his female friends, "on hospitable thoughts intent," for their ordinary provision for their households ; and that he was really partaking of a feast, especially provided for an esteemed guest, when he supposed himself only sharing a family dinner. They will in future better know how to do him honor, by a "simple dish," of "meat, bread, potatoes and salt." For ourselves, we have known many, in our humble sphere, who often think of making out a meal from "a single dish," in the sense in which our author uses this phraseology ; and we had not thought of regarding them as wonderful specimens of temperance in so doing.

Neither does it appear to us that the author has much occasion for the apprehension, to which he so often alludes, that he will be thought to restrict too closely the quantity of food which he allows. Except in the mere feeling of living by weight, the man who is allowed his "twelve to sixteen ounces" of meat and vegetables, and fourteen to twenty-four ounces of liquids, would seem to us to have very little reason to cry out against "starvation." And if we take a pretty liberal interpretation of his description of what he regards as a "single dish," he need be no cynic who shall be satisfied with the variety allowed.

The fourth lecture was written as a prize essay on the use of alcohol and other narcotics, and has been separately published under the direction of the American Temperance Society. It is written with more care, and consequently in better style, than the rest of the book.

In reference to the use of distilled spirits, this essay is a *highly valuable production*. It takes a judicious and practical view of the indispensable importance of abstaining from them habitually

and entirely, and applies the subject with great force and energy to the condition of literary young men, whose situation and prospects promise such an extensive influence upon the well being of society.

In regard to the subject of wines, we think discrimination necessary, and we regret to find that Professor H. "groups" them with spirit, opium, and tobacco, "as alike to be rejected, because they agree in being poisonous in their nature," "unnecessary to the healthy, incapable of affording nourishment to the body, fascinating to diseased appetite, and destructive to property, health, and life." "They ought, therefore, to be all proscribed together." Of a great proportion of the wine sold in our country, this may be true; and perhaps even more might be safely said. For the fact is, that though it bears the name of wine, it is not such in reality. It is "a vicious counterfeit," a drugged, adulterated mixture, variously prepared, according to the taste and skill of the manufacturer, and which cannot be too cautiously meddled with. Our remarks will have respect to *real wine*, and our principal object in making them will be to caution the friends of temperance from weakening their efforts, by dividing on this point. There is nothing, unless it be a remission of effort in this cause, we should so much deprecate, as division. The true state of the case, we conceive to be this: All agree that intemperance with wine is no more to be encouraged, or tolerated, than intemperance with distilled spirits. On the other hand, we believe that all, or nearly all, will agree, that there is not produced the same injury to the constitution by a moderate use of wine, even although it be habitual, nor the same direct and immediate tendency to intemperance, which are the necessary effects of the habitual use of spirits in any quantity, however small the beginning. If therefore wine is to be retained in use among temperate men, it is not as the means of intemperance, but because the moderate use of it is believed by some to be innocent and safe, if not decidedly beneficial. If on the other hand, it is to be rejected, it is not because it is "poisonous in its nature," but because the moderate use of it is thought to be too liable to run into excess to be safe, and to take something from the force of the arguments against the use of spirits. In either view of the case, it rests upon ground entirely different from that of ardent spirits; and to denounce it in the same terms is, in our view, injudicious, both because it gives offence to some decided and zealous friends of a good cause, and because it weakens the force of argument and language as applied to the more important article.

We have neither time nor room for a particular examination of the remaining parts of these lectures, which relate chiefly to regimen and employment. It is, however, but justice to the author, and to ourselves, to say, that if we were to do

this, we should find much less, in which our opinion would differ from his, than we have in regard to diet. The author has just views of the importance of exercise, and if he should succeed, as we trust he may, in enforcing his views upon the officers and members of our colleges, he will accomplish much in promoting their prosperity, in the best sense of the word. His allowance of from seven to eight hours for sleep, will be thought sufficiently liberal, by any student. On the subject of clothing, we hoped to have found some remarks on walking in cloaks, so common in some colleges, and in no very cold weather. As they impede a free use of the limbs in exercise, promote slovenliness in dress and manners, and distort and deform the person, they ought to be discarded, except in journeys, during the winter.

We have already said, that the leading principle of these lectures is to recommend temperance, both in eating and drinking, as the only proper foundation of health. They also urge the importance of a regular course of exercise, attention to clothing, proper hours of sleep, &c. In all these respects, the tendency of the work is *altogether useful*. We have differed from the author in some points of detail, but *not in his great principles*; and we are persuaded that these differences will be diminished, when he gives his work a thorough revisal, such as his plan of publication precluded before it was printed.—This volume well deserves, and we are happy to learn is receiving, an extensive patronage. If most people believe only half of it, and reduce it to practice, they will find themselves richly compensated for its purchase and perusal.

THE IMPORTANCE AND NECESSITY OF CHRISTIANS CONSIDERING JESUS CHRIST IN THE EXTENT OF HIS HIGH AND GLORIOUS CHARACTER. *A Sermon preached at the South Church in Boston. By Samuel Hopkins, A. M., Minister of the Gospel in Great Barrington.* Boston: Kneeland & Adams. 1768. pp. 35.

IN the Memoirs of Dr. Hopkins, written by himself, we find the following paragraph: "In 1768, a Sermon which I preached in the Old South Meeting House in Boston was published, at the desire of a number of the hearers. The title of it is, 'The Importance and Necessity of Christians considering Jesus Christ in the extent of his high and glorious Character.' The text Heb. iii. 1. It was composed with a design to preach it in Boston, as I expected soon to go there, under a conviction that the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was *much neglected*, if not *disbelieved*, by a number of the ministers of Boston." p. 95.

A copy of this sermon has recently fallen into our hands; and as more than sixty years have elapsed since its delivery and publication, and probably few now living have ever seen it, or have any knowledge of its contents; we have thought it might interest our readers to be furnished with some account of it, accompanied with free extracts. A notice of this kind, while it may serve as a memorial of one of the most eminent and excellent of the last generation of ministers in New England, will show, at the same time, how the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity was estimated, what stress was laid upon it, with what vigilance it was guarded, and with what ability defended, by faithful men who have lived before us. It will show, too, that exclusiveness, as it is now called, is not peculiar to the present generation; that sixty years ago, when suspicions of Arianism were first entertained, and numbers were disposed to regard the insidious error, if not with complacency, at least without apprehension, there were those who dared to lift a strong voice against it, to sound an alarm to the slumbering churches, and to give prominence to the sentiment that all who did not "consider Jesus Christ in the *extent* of his high and glorious character," as "God manifest in the flesh," were virtually guilty of denying him. It will further show, that the predictions which were then uttered, as to the results of a departure from the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, have been more than realized; and that those, at that period, who pretended there was no danger, and urged the exercise of an indiscriminate charity, were either themselves corrupted, or grossly deluded.

The sermon is from these words: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and High Priest of our profession, *Christ Jesus*." "The august, wonderful, infinitely grand and glorious personage spoken of in the text, called the apostle and High Priest of the Christian's profession, and who is represented as most worthy of the constant and earnest attention of all Christians," is the Lord Jesus Christ.

The plan of the author led him to inquire, first, "What is *implied* in the exhortation and command here given, to consider Christ Jesus?" And, secondly, "Of what *use and importance* is it to all Christians thus to consider Christ?"

"To consider Christ Jesus implies a degree of true discerning and understanding with respect to the character of Christ; for where there is nothing of this, Christ is not considered at all. If his true character is not understood or known in any degree, then he is not the object of the thoughts and attention of the mind, but something else which is different from it: for that is never the object of a person's thoughts and consideration, of which he has no true idea and conception at all. Two persons may have entirely different and opposite notions of Christ Jesus: those of one may be agreeable to the truth, by which Christ's true and real character is

extant in his mind : those of the other may be essentially and wholly wrong and false ; yet they may use the same name to express their different and opposite ideas and notions, and ascribe them to the same person, whom they agree to call Jesus Christ. In this case, whatever thoughts and exercises the latter has about what he calls Christ, it is certain he does not truly consider this person, but something else. And his views and exercises may not be properly called Christian ; for they are really the reverse."

"Nor can they be properly said to consider Christ Jesus, who leave out of their view the most essential and important part of his character ; and in all their thoughts of him sink him down infinitely lower, and make him infinitely less than he really is. To consider Christ Jesus is to understand and keep in view that in his person and character which infinitely distinguishes him from all others, and in which his truest excellence and glory and sufficiency as High Priest,—as Mediator and the Saviour of sinners, chiefly consists."

"This consideration also implies a steady, engaged attention of heart to this object, by which Christ Jesus may be, as it were, always present to the mind, and it may be hereby enlarged, and take in more and more of this grand and glorious object, and so 'grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'"

The importance—to all Christians—of thus considering the great apostle and High Priest of their profession, is urged from the following considerations :

1. The knowledge of Jesus Christ, considered in the extent, greatness and glory of his character, comprises the *whole of Christian knowledge*.

"In the knowledge of Jesus Christ is implied and comprised the highest and most clear knowledge of God, of the divine character and perfections, and the most important and glorious works of God. He who knows Christ, knows the truths and doctrines of Christianity : He understands the precepts and duties of it : He knows where his true interest lies ; what is true enjoyment and happiness, and the way in which the children of men may obtain it. In a word, he is at the fountain head of knowledge and wisdom. Therefore St. Paul turned all his attention to this great High Priest, and desired and 'determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.'

2. Jesus Christ is an unbounded, *infinite* object of knowledge.

"He is so great and glorious a personage, and his works are so grand and wonderful, and of such infinite and amazing influence and consequence, that a finite mind may be all attention to him, and expatiate and enlarge in views of him, without ever coming to an end, or seeing all that belongs to him. He is so great, and so much is comprehended in him, that however enlarged and grand ideas the Christian has of him already, they may, by further

consideration and study, be still increased, and swift advances made without end."

3. All Christian *holiness* and *true happiness* consist summarily in beholding and considering the high and glorious character of Jesus Christ.

"Hence Christ asks for the redeemed, as that in which their happiness will consist, that they may be where he is, and behold him in the glory of his Mediatorial character. His words are remarkable. 'Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me.' Jesus Christ is, and will always be, the grand medium of all divine communications of knowledge, holiness and enjoyment to the creature, especially to the redeemed. He is, in this respect, 'the bread of life,' on whom all depend for life and enjoyment. And the more Christians in this world behold the glory of Christ, and constantly attend to and consider him, the more holy and happy are they. For he is their only support and comfort, and on him they hang all their hopes."

4. Jesus Christ, in all the greatness and glory of his character, is to the Christian the only ground of *pardon and acceptance*.

"Christ's ability and sufficiency to make atonement for sin, and obtain eternal salvation for sinners, so far consists in his greatness and dignity, or the excellence and worthiness of his person and character, that were it not for these he could have made no atonement at all. Were he not a person of infinite dignity and worthiness, and so higher, infinitely higher than the heavens, even a divine person and truly God, he would be infinitely far from being able to make atonement for the least sin. If all the angels in heaven, however great, worthy and numerous they are, while yet they are no more than creatures, should unite to interpose in the behalf of one sinner, who had been guilty of but one sin, and that the least that is possible; and offer their worthiness, yea, their whole eternal interest and happiness, and to subject themselves to perfect, eternal misery for his sake, that he might, out of respect to this, be pardoned, and received to the rewards of eternal life: I say, should all the angels in heaven thus interpose, the proposal and offer would not only be rejected, but would itself be an act of high rebellion, and carry in it a contempt of God and his law, and a virtual justifying the sinner and taking his part against God."

"If therefore Christ was not infinitely higher and greater than all the angels in heaven, and did he not exceed them infinitely in excellence and worth, he could not be an High Priest, in whom sinners might reasonably put any trust for pardon and acceptance with God. Yea, on such a supposition, trusting in him would not only be unsafe and dangerous, but direct rebellion against God and highly criminal."*

* What then shall we say of those who profess to trust in a mere creature for all this; which is the case of all who deny the Divinity of Christ?—And what shall be said of those who trust in their own righteousness to recommend them to God, under whatever profession this is done? This is daring presumption, and high handed wickedness, being

5. The true Christian hopes for *redemption from the power of sin* only through Christ in his high and exalted character.

“When a person sees what sin is, what fast hold it has of him, how deep and strongly it is rooted in his heart; how powerful and various are the workings of it, how grievous and deadly are the disorders and wounds of his sinful heart, utterly incurable by any finite wisdom and power; I say, when a person becomes acquainted with his state in this respect, he finds he wants a Redeemer and Saviour infinitely powerful, wise and good; and that any other would be infinitely insufficient for him. He therefore could have no hope of redemption from sin by Christ, did he not view him as infinitely greater and more sufficient than any mere creature. But when he beholds and considers Christ in the height of his character, as being infinitely wise, powerful and good, with whom nothing is impossible, he with confidence and joy commits his disordered, sinful, wretched soul into his hands, assured that he is able to cure and sanctify his heart, and make him perfectly holy.”

“Many a person, ignorant of the nature of sin, and of the degree of extent and power sin had in his heart, has seen no need that he stood in of an infinite Redeemer. But not so the true Christian. He finds he wants a Redeemer to deliver him from sin, and bring him to perfect holiness, who is higher than the heavens, has creating power, and is able to subdue all things unto himself.”

6. Christians should well understand, and keep in view, the true character of Him, in *whose name they are directed to pray*.

“To ask in the name of Christ, is to depend on his worthiness alone, as that on account of which we shall be accepted and heard. Therefore asking in his name supposes and implies a view and sense of heart of his greatness and worthiness. So far as the infinitely excellent and worthy character of Christ is out of sight and disregarded by any one, just so far he is without a true spirit of prayer, and does not ask in Christ’s name.”

7. It belongs to the character of Christians that ‘*whatsoever they do, in word or deed*, they do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.’ Col. iii. 17. “But this is to do all in a view and sense of his *true character*. Hence it appears, that Christians in no case exercise themselves and act agreeably to their profession, unless they keep in view and rightly consider the character of Jesus Christ.”

The considerations here urged are as true now, and altogether as important, as they were at the time when they were uttered. Are there not numbers at this day, and some who profess the Orthodox faith, who have no just conceptions of the importance and necessity of entertaining right views respecting the Saviour? They

a direct opposition to the divine character, and God’s holy law. In this view, it appears that all the good works of such, in which they trust for infinitely more than they might reasonably do, were they perfectly holy, are heaven daring sins; the most abominable rebellion against God, and direct opposition to Jesus Christ and the gospel.

hear persons speak respectfully of Christ, representing him as a teacher sent from God, and professing to regard him as their Lord and Master ; and this, it is thought, is quite enough. There need be no inquiry whether the personage of whom they speak is really the Christ of the New Testament, or a mere fiction of their own imagining. But if he is not the Saviour revealed in the Bible, the great apostle and High Priest of the Christian's profession, how can he make an atonement for sin, or deliver from its reigning power, or open a way of access to God, or be to his people a foundation of hope, or a Redeemer in whom they may safely trust to secure the salvation of their souls ?

The discourse concludes with three reflections.

1. How important is it that Christ should be *preached*, in all the grandeur and glory of his character.

"Many professed preachers of the Gospel have been greatly deficient here. Many leave Christ very much, or altogether, out of their preaching: or leave out the most essential part of his character, and never bring it into view in all they say of him. They often use the name of Christ, and have much to say about him: but all they say of him is either not true, and so gives him a wrong and false character; or if true, it falls short of his whole character; yea, leaves the most essential part of it, and what may be justly considered as comprizing all its glory, wholly out, unthought of and neglected."

"However the multitude may admire preachers of this sort, it is certain the true Christian will not be fed, but famish and starve under such preaching as this, while that which is the proper support, food and life of his soul, even Christ in his true and glorious character, is not set before him."

"What then shall we say of those who expressly deny the Divinity of Christ, and represent him as no more than a mere creature! If they do not preach Christ who silently pass over his Divine dignity and glory, infinitely the greatest, and most essential part of his character, and without which there is nothing in his person and character that can be the reasonable ground of hope, support and life to the true Christian; must not they who expressly deny that he is the true God, and consequently hold that he is only a mere creature, be justly looked upon and treated as preaching against Christ, and perverting and overthrowing the whole Gospel? They may speak in strong terms, and high and pompous strains of the dignity and excellence of Christ. But when it is considered that, whatever pompous words they use, they are applied to one infinitely below God, being but a mere creature, all they say on this head, is really nothing but unmeaning jargon, which is infinitely dishonorable to Christ, and leaves the Christian without any true ground of hope and comfort."

"He feels that no person can make atonement for him but one of infinite dignity and worth, who has something infinitely great to offer. And did he not see and believe in such an one, he must sink into abso-

lute despair ; and could not reasonably *desire* that any mercy should be showed to him. He therefore who denies the divinity of Christ, does what he can to rob the Christian of all his treasure—of all his hopes—of all his salvation ! And the reason why he himself wants no greater mediator and saviour than a mere creature, and calls that an atonement for sin which such an one has made, and trusts in it, is his blindness and insensibility with respect to his own character, which is grounded in his shocking insensibility to the glory of the divine character, and enmity to it.”

Mr. H. here considers the question, “Whether they who believe the divinity of Jesus Christ, and trust in him for pardon and salvation, may and ought to have charity for those, and look on them as good Christians, who expressly deny this doctrine, and represent those as idolators who pay any regards and honors to him which may not be given to a mere creature?”

“These persons have in truth infinitely different ideas and thoughts of Jesus Christ, and consequently must differ in the leading and essential doctrines of Christianity ; so that they do not all know and acknowledge the true and only Saviour, or believe in the same person and character. If he who believes in Jesus Christ as a divine person, as truly God, and places all his hopes of salvation by him on this foundation, is right, which he must think himself to be ; then he who denies this article is wrong ; and so wrong, that he does, in the view of the other, leave out of his thoughts and religion infinitely the greatest and most glorious part of the character of the Mediator, even so as quite to spoil it and render it worthless. How can these two walk together, who are so far from being agreed that they oppose each other most directly in the highest and most leading article of Christianity, in their infinitely different and opposite notions of the character of the author of it, and which really comprizes the whole ! The former looks on the other as robbing Christ of his chief glory, and denying that to belong to him which is the only ground of faith and trust in him. How then can the professed faith of the latter in one who, in the view of the former, can be no more a saviour of sinners, than Mahomet himself, or any of the imaginary deities of the heathen, recommend him to his charity, any more than if he made no profession at all ?”

“I know some who would be thought to believe the divinity of Christ, or at least do not deny this doctrine, have declared their charity for those who expressly deny it ; and have been forward and zealous to rank some of them among the number of eminently holy men and good Christians. But this is not only very absurd and shocking ; but really carries with it no small degree of impiety and profaneness. It seems to be trifling with Christianity at a great rate. Surely Christianity is not worth much, if it is no matter of importance whether the author of it, who is the revealed Saviour for sinners to trust in, be God, or a mere creature ; so that they may be equally good Christians, whatever is their belief with respect to Jesus Christ.* If it is no matter what they think of Christ, but may

* I desire it may be considered, whether the ordaining councils who neglect to examine candidates for the ministry, with respect to their religious sentiments ; and they who

differ infinitely in their sentiments of his person and character ; then it is certainly no matter whether they have any thoughts about Christ at all, or any ideas of him, or belief in him ; and the Deist who rejects Christ's whole character, may be as good a man, and as certainly happy forever, as the best Christian who has the most just idea of Christ, and is a true believer in him."

"If Arians are to be esteemed good Christians by those whose thoughts of Christ are infinitely different from theirs, why may not the Mahometans also be ranked among truly pious and good men, in the sure way to eternal life ? They have not the good luck indeed of being called Christians : But they acknowledge Jesus Christ to be a true prophet, sent of God ; so are in a sense believers in him. They may perhaps have as high notions of the character of Christ as many professed Christians who deny his divinity ; though by the unhappy prejudices of education, they set Mahomet above him, as being a greater person. Shall this mistake damn them ? Surely not ! If the errors and blasphemies the Arians are guilty of relating to Jesus Christ, in the clear sun-shine of divine revelation, shall not be fatal to them."*

"In short these charitable persons are either themselves Arians, and do not really believe the divinity of Jesus Christ, but are, for certain reasons, unwilling to let their sentiments on this head be known ; or if, through the force of education, or on some other ground, they assert this doctrine, they do not understand the true reason and import of it, and so have never seen their need of such a Saviour. In this view, their *extensive charity*, upon which they value themselves, and of which they boast, is so far from being an evidence of the greatness of their minds, or the goodness of their hearts, that it is rather a very clear and striking evidence that they have never yet understood the true nature and genius of genuine Christianity : that

zealously oppose such examinations, do not by this conduct openly declare that it is with them no matter of importance what men believe, what their sentiments are, and what doctrines they hold with respect to Jesus Christ, or what thoughts they have of his character and religion. And is not this, in effect, openly to declare, that the truths of the Gospel are of no importance, and that Christianity is really but a trifling affair !

The conduct of these gentlemen is really surprising, and none need to be at a loss what will be the fate of Christianity, so far as their influence reaches. All the distinguishing, important doctrines of it will be neglected ; and instead of preaching the Gospel, sermons will be either insipid dissertations upon something else, or filled with stupid inconsistency, or else be only florid harangues, without any meaning. Unless perhaps, when times and circumstances will bear it, another system of doctrines will be preached up, which at present are somewhat unpopular ; therefore cannot be with safety expressly and openly espoused ; for the sake, of which, that they may be *privily* introduced, and from a desire and design to extirpate the more commonly received, popular doctrine, many think they have good reason to conclude this method with respect to candidates is gone into."

* "I know this will be thought by some exceeding uncharitable, harsh and cruel. They will say, 'It is intolerable, and argues a vast degree of arrogance and pride, as well as ignorance and a base contractedness of mind, to doom all those to destruction, who have not been able to see that Jesus Christ is the true God, and equal with the Father. This is a very disputable point, and many great and, to all appearance, good men have taken the negative side.'

Ans. All this may as truly, and with as much propriety be said of professed Deists. It is a very disputable point, whether Jesus of Nazareth was sent of God, or was a wicked impostor ; that is, it has been greatly disputed ; as much, perhaps, as any one point that respects Christianity. And many who are acknowledged to be great men ; and some, at least, whose moral conduct has been regular and unexceptionable, have not been able to see the evidence of his divine mission, and have improved all their powers and advantages in opposition to Christianity."

they do not know Christ, so have not received the witness that God has given concerning him, and truly believed on his name."*

2. This subject naturally introduces a short but most interesting and important question, *What think ye of Christ?*

"If we know Christ, and have right views and thoughts of him, we are then his friends indeed, and shall dwell with him forever. But if his true character is not understood by us, and our views and thoughts of him are essentially wrong, and we continue in this error and darkness until death, we shall be excluded from his presence and dwell in darkness forever. How greatly then does this question concern us all! We may well think of it with solemn attention and self-application."

3. Let all professing Christians hearken to the exhortation in the text, and attentively consider the apostle and High Priest of their profession, Christ Jesus.

"Jesus Christ is an object so vastly extensive, and infinitely great, that he cannot be attended to too much and too long. No matter how soon and early in life persons begin to consider Christ in earnest. The theme is boundless, the subject inexhaustible. Here then is a foundation laid for the most attentive and engaged inquiries, and highest and growing entertainment of the redeemed forever in heaven: "Where there is no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it: for the glory of God does lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

This sermon is written in the usual clear and flowing style of Dr. Hopkins, without much regard to the choice and collocation of words, or the construction of sentences. It shows a serious, earnest mind, and a heart deeply concerned for the honor of the Saviour, the purity of the churches and the salvation of souls. A

* "OBJECTION. We are told that he who has not *Charity* is nothing. *Charity* is the ornament and glory of a Christian; and where this is not, there is no real religion. Is it not astonishing, then, that any should be condemned for their charity; that *this* should be reckoned against them, as an argument that they who exercise it, in the utmost stretch of it, are no Christians!"

"ANS. In such a way of talk as this, the word *charity* is greatly abused, and perverted from its true meaning. *Charity* is love to God and our neighbor, which is the whole that the divine law requires; and therefore comprises all true holiness. This love to God and man has no tendency to lead the person who exercises it, to think all are good men and true Christians, who profess Christianity; much less does it consist in this. But, on the contrary, it gives a degree of true discerning in spiritual things which others have not; and leads the mind to such attention to the divine character, and fills the heart of the true Christian with such a tenderness and jealousy for the honor of this character, that he more readily discerns, and tenderly feels, what is opposition to it. And to have no discerning in this case, but to embrace those as good Christians who openly oppose and speak against Christ, is so far from being an exercise of charity, that it is a glaring evidence of their want of true love to Christ. St. Paul, in the exercise of all this charity, pronounced those accursed who preach another Gospel, and told the Galatians that a mistake about the ground of the sinner's acceptance with God was fatal. And St. John, while he is in the warmest manner recommending charity or love, declares that they who hold not the truth concerning Christ, have no interest in God's favor, and orders Christians to reject them."

Many speak of charity as if it wholly consisted in a readiness to think *every one* a true Christian. And the more unlike a Christian any one appears, speaks and acts, the higher degree of charity is required to believe he is a good Christian. And he is the best man who can exercise the greatest stretch of charity towards them who, in this sense, have the most need of it."

temper like this may be denounced as bigotry, but we regard it as the only true, apostolic charity.

We mean not to be answerable for every expression used in this sermon, and yet, we hesitate not to say that we think it one of distinguished excellence. In order to feel the force of it, the reader must throw himself back, in imagination, to the time when it was delivered. All the churches in this region then stood in a profession of Orthodoxy; and yet appearances of a defection began to be observed. The wily heretic had cloaked himself under a fair exterior, but there were watchful eyes about him, whose search he could not entirely elude. He urged the importance of mutual charity; but was answered that charity rejoiceth only in the *truth*. He insisted on the right of private judgement; but was told that this conferred no right to sin against God, or to corrupt his people. Under these circumstances, a preacher comes from beyond the mountains, from the then back settlements of Massachusetts, and lifts a note of solemn warning, of affectionate, earnest expostulation. Without doubt, he was regarded by many as an ignorant intruder—a stranger to the courtesies of polished life—who had better go back and feed the few sheep he had left in the wilderness. But O that he had been duly listened to! O that his words of truth and soberness had been believed and regarded! What an amount of evil might thus have been avoided! The foulest blot, which has ever stained the religious character of New England, might then have passed from us.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE FAITH OF PROTESTANTS ON THE SUBJECT OF INSPIRATION.

"By the inspiration of the Scriptures," says Professor Norton, "is meant, either that they were miraculously suggested by God, or that they were written under his miraculous superintendence."* According to this definition, the justness of which we shall not dispute, the inspiration of the Scriptures is now publicly denied by leading Unitarians in this country. "The composition of the Bible is looked upon as a *human work*—a work produced by the *natural operation of human thought and feeling*." "These writings (the Scriptures) so far as their composition is concerned, are to be regarded as possessing a properly and purely human character. "They, (the Scriptures) *are not in the common sense inspired; they were not produced under the miraculous supervision of the Deity*." "A denial of the immediate inspiration of the Scriptures does not, in the slightest degree, affect their authority."† And not only do these gentlemen deny the inspiration of our sacred books, they would make the impression that this is a very small matter, in which they do not disagree with

* Locke and LeClerc, p. 125.

† Christian Examiner.

the majority of Christians of other times and the present; and *we* are represented as unreasonable, captious, superstitious, in complaining of them for so very common and trifling a thing as denying the inspiration of the Bible. We have thought it might be useful, therefore, to confront them with the sentiment of the whole Protestant world on the subject, so far as this could be conveniently gathered; and we have been at the trouble to consult a variety of Confessions of faith, the language of which, so far as relates to the inspiration of the Scriptures, is given in the following extracts:

FIRST HELVETIC CONFESSION, *published in 1532.*

"The canonical Scripture, *the word of God, being delivered by the Holy Spirit*, and proposed to the world by prophets and apostles, is altogether the most ancient and perfect philosophy, and itself alone contains the whole of piety, and the whole reason of life."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, *published in 1566.*

"We believe and profess that the canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of both Testaments are *the true word of God itself*, and have sufficient authority of themselves, and not from men. For *God himself spake* to the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, and *still speaks to us* through the Holy Scriptures." "So that when, at this day, this word of God is proclaimed in the church by those who are lawfully called to be preachers, we believe that *the word of God itself* is proclaimed and received by the faithful; neither is there any other word of God to be pretended to or expected from heaven."*

BOHEMIAN OR WALDENSIAN CONFESSION.

"First of all, the ministers of our churches teach with one consent concerning the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which they are accustomed to call the Bible, and which have been legitimately received and approved by Orthodox fathers, that they are true, certain, and worthy of a confidence with which no other human writings, whatever they may be, are able to compare." And for this reason, because *they were inspired and suggested by the Holy Spirit*, and published from the mouth of holy men, and confirmed by heavenly and divine attestations."

CONFESSION OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT CHURCHES, *published in 1559.*

"The one God hath so revealed himself to men, in his works, but much more clearly in *his word*, which at first he made known by infallible signs, and by (oraculis) oracular responses. These, he directed should be written in those books which we call the sacred Scriptures." "We believe that *the word contained in these books, proceeded from God alone*, from whom alone, and not from men, it derives its authority."

* This Confession, as Dr. Jamieson informs us, ("save the allowance of the remembrance of some holidays) was all *approved and subscribed*" by the General Assembly of Scotland, Dec. 25, 1566.

• OLD ENGLISH CONFESSION.*

"We receive and embrace all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and we render thanks to our God who hath brought this light to us which we may have always in our eyes, lest, by the arts of men, or the wiles of the devil, we may be drawn aside to errors and fables. We receive and embrace these Scriptures as *voices from heaven*, (*cælestes voces*) by which God hath revealed his will to us. In these alone the minds of men are able to rest."

BELGIC CONFESSION, *published in 1566.*

"We confess that this word of God was not reported or delivered by any human will, but holy men of God uttered it, *being moved by the divine Spirit*." "Afterwards, God himself commanded his servants, the apostles and prophets, that they should commit *his revelations* (*sua illa oracula*) to writing."

WIRTEMBERG CONFESSION, *published in 1552.*

"Those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, concerning whose authority in the church there never has been any doubt, we call the sacred Scriptures. This Scripture we believe and profess to be *the response* (*oraculum*) *of the Holy Spirit*, and so confirmed by divine testimonies, that if an angel from heaven should preach anything different, he would be accursed."

IRISH CONFESSION.†

"The ground of our religion, and the rule of faith and all saving truth is *the word of God* contained in the Holy Scripture. By the name of Holy Scripture we understand all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament;"—"all which we acknowledge to be given by the inspiration of God, and in that regard to be of the most certain credit, and the highest authority. The other books, commonly called apocryphal, *did not proceed from such inspiration*, and therefore are not of sufficient authority to establish any point of doctrine."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.‡

"Under the name of Holy Scripture, or *word of God written*, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments;"—

* Published in the name of the English Church in Bishop Jewel's Apology, 1562.—The following is from the Homily of the English Church, "on the Reverent Estimation of God's word." "The whole Scriptures, saith St. Paul, were given by the inspiration of God. And shall we, Christian men, think to learn the knowledge of God and ourselves in any earthly man's work or writing, sooner or better than in the Holy Scriptures, **WRITTEN BY THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY GHOST?** The Scriptures *were not brought unto us by the will of man*, but holy men of God, as witnesseth St. Peter, spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit of God."—The sentiment of the English Church on this subject is understood to be fully adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church in England and America.

† Agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops and the rest of the clergy of Ireland in the Convocation at Dublin, A. D. 1615.

‡ Published and adopted by the Presbyterians of England and Scotland, in 1647. Adopted by the planters of New England in 1648;—afterwards, so far as relates to the subject of inspiration, by the Independents of England in 1658, by the Congregationalists of this country in 1680, and by the Baptist churches in England in 1696. This is also the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterians in the United States.

"all which are given *by the inspiration of God* to be the rule of faith and life. The books commonly called Apocrypha, *not being of divine inspiration*, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of, than other human writings. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, *the Author thereof*; and therefore it is to be received, because *it is the word of God*." "The Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, *being immediately inspired by God*, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical, so as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them." — "The Holy Scripture *was delivered by the Spirit*, into which Scripture, so delivered, our faith is finally resolved."

WESTMINSTER CATECHISM.

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament *are the word of God*, the only rule of faith and obedience."

DR. EMMONS' SERMONS.

THE first sermon, in the sixth and last volume published by Dr. Emmons, is from Acts xxiv. 14, and is entitled 'Faithful Ministers avow their Religious Sentiments.' After establishing this point, and showing the reason for it, the first general Reflection is as follows:

"If the true ministers of the Gospel preach their sentiments openly and boldly; then it is natural to suppose, that false teachers will use every artifice to conceal their sentiments. Accordingly, we find that the inspired writers represent them, as seducers, deceivers, evil workers, who lie in wait to deceive, and employ every artifice to captivate the hearts rather than to enlighten the understanding, and convince the consciences of their hearers."

"All false teachers imbibe the spirit of the first and great deceiver, and never fail to discover a peculiar skill in the arts of deception. They learn to conceal their sentiments, by good words, fair speeches and ambiguous expressions. They learn how to improve the most favorable seasons for pouring their false instructions into the minds of the ignorant, unlearned, and unsuspecting, by familiar conversation and more public discourses. They act upon the principle, that the end sanctifies the means: so that they allow themselves to employ any means of deception and seduction, which they think will be the most successful. This is exactly the representation of false teachers, which is given in the text I have cited. And this representation is fully confirmed by stubborn and well known facts. Dr. Chauncy concealed his false doctrine of Universal Salvation,

from everybody but his intimate friends, for more than forty years ; and he never published it in America, but only in England, just before he left the world. Dr. Huntington concealed his scheme of Universal Salvation a long time, and never suffered it be published till after his death. When Mr. Murray, the Universalist, first came to America, he preached occasionally in some of the largest and best congregations in New England before he avowed his corrupt sentiments. There have been Unitarians, in this State, of different forms, degrees, or shades of difference, above fifty years ; but they generally concealed their sentiments, till very lately, they have been reluctantly compelled to avow them. Though sectarians may boast of the success they gain by their arts of concealment and deception ; yet they have no right to boast of their integrity. Those and those only, who avow their religious sentiments, as the primitive preachers of the Gospel did, have the claim of integrity, which none can justly deny them. Transparency is a beautiful trait in any human character. False teachers themselves would appear to much better advantage, if they would renounce all their arts of deception, and unfair, not to say unchristian modes of dividing and corrupting religious societies."

The second sermon in this volume is on "The Right of Private Judgement." The plan of the author is to show, first, "what it is to exercise the right of private judgement ;" and secondly, "that men ought to exercise it, in forming their religious sentiments."

The right of private judgement "is the right which every man has, of seeing with his own eyes, hearing with his own ears, and of exercising his own reason, in forming his religious opinions. When any man, without any compulsion or restraint, freely exercises his own natural abilities, in forming his sentiments, he exercises all the right of private judgement, that he can have, or enjoy."

This implies, 1. "A right to hear what may be said upon the subject to be decided ;" 2. "to examine every subject for ourselves, and employ all our rational powers in investigating the truth ;" and 3. to "form our opinions according to the best light we can obtain."

"After a man knows what others have said, or written ; and after he has thought, and searched the Scriptures, upon any religious subject, he has a right to form his own judgement exactly according to evidence. He has no right to exercise prejudice, or partiality ; but he has a right to exercise impartiality, in spite of all the world. After all the evidence is collected from every quarter, then it is the proper business of the understanding, or judgement, to compare and balance evidence, and to form a decisive opinion, or belief, according to apparent truth. We have no more right to judge without evidence, than we have to judge contrary to evidence ; and we have no more right to doubt without, or contrary to evidence, than we have to believe without, or contrary to evidence. We have no right to keep ourselves in a state of doubt, or uncertainty, when we have sufficient evidence to come to a decision. The command is, "Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good." The meaning is, examine all things ; and after examination, decide what is right."

Men ought exercise the right of private judgement in forming their religious sentiments, because 1. "God has made them *capable* of judging for themselves" in these matters; 2. He has given them "the proper *means* of forming their own religious sentiments;" and 3. he "has appointed none to judge for them."

"It is true, God has appointed teachers, but not judges. The preachers of the Gospel are to explain and inculcate the doctrines of it, and place them in as clear, plain and convincing a light as they can. But after all they have done to exhibit and support the truth, the hearers are to judge for themselves, whether those things they have heard be the truth. They have the same sure word of inspiration, to assist them in determining what is truth, that their teachers have; and they are obliged to consult it. Teachers, indeed, have often been disposed to assume the power and authority of dictating. And the Christian Church has suffered great injury, for ages, from the bigotry and usurpation of those, who have sustained the office of sacred guides. But it was not so from the beginning. The apostles and primitive preachers of the Gospel disclaimed all dominion over men's faith, and professed to be only helpers in promoting their knowledge and holiness. And none, who sustain the office of the ministry, have any right to impose their own opinions upon their hearers, by virtue of their sacred office. The Pope and all his hierarchy are usurpers, whose pretensions to supreme power and infallibility in the church are to be treated with disdain, as vile impositions. The people are their own proper judges of religious truth and error, and of ecclesiastical power. Christian churches have a right to form their own creeds and exercise their own discipline, independently of any superior ecclesiastical power on earth. As God has appointed none to judge and dictate for them in these serious concerns, so they are under indispensable obligations to exercise their own private judgement."

Dr. E. urges farther, in support of his position, that "God has forbidden men to take their religious sentiments from others, upon trust;" and that "every man must feel the effects of his own religious opinions, and consequently ought to exercise his own judgement in forming them."

"True religious sentiments are essential to true religion. Men cannot have true religion, without having the true knowledge of God, and of the essential doctrines of the Gospel. Accordingly, every man's religion will be effected by the religious sentiments which he cordially embraces. It is, therefore, of as much importance to form our own religious sentiments, and to form them according to truth, as to have true religion; and it is of as much importance to have true religion, as it is to secure the salvation of our souls. If we suffer others to form our religious sentiments for us, yet God will not suffer us to escape the effects of our folly and guilt. We must feel the effects of our own principles, as well as of our own practice. We must give an account of our faith, as well as of our conduct. Not only our temporal, but our eternal interests, are concerned in forming our religious sentiments. Let us remember that we must all stand before the

judgement seat of Christ, who has told us, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."

We feel a pleasure in publishing the foregoing extracts, because they express entirely our own sentiments, and we believe those of our brethren generally. Notwithstanding the accusations fulminated against us from certain high places in this vicinity, the *truth* is, there are no more strenuous advocates of religious freedom, and of the right of private judgement in matters of religion, than the Orthodox of New England. We think for ourselves, and we wish others to think for themselves. We endeavor to call things by their right names, and we wish others to do the same. We profess to be willing to be swayed by reason and argument drawn from facts and the word of God, and this is the only influence which we desire to exert in forming the opinions and characters of others. We wish not to be persecuted or punished for our opinions, and (unless our hearts greatly deceive us) we should be just as unwilling to see the most strenuous of our opposers persecuted or punished for theirs. In the language of the venerable author from whom we have quoted, Let every one 'see with his own eyes' hear with his own ears, and exercise his own faculties in forming his religious opinions, remembering at the same time, that he is responsible to the Judge of all for the principles he embraces, and that if he abuses the freedom granted him, he must feel the effects of his own folly and guilt.

THE THEATRE.

HITHERTO our pages have been silent in relation to the theatre, partly because we have not had time to take up the subject in the manner and to the extent we wished, and partly because we presumed that anything *we* should say would not be likely to do much good. It is well understood, and has been for a long time, that the religious community to which we are attached are decidedly opposed to the theatre—opposed to it on principle—opposed to it in every form it has assumed, or is likely to assume, in this wicked world. We do not patronise this amusement ourselves, nor is it patronised, to any extent, by those of our families, our religious connexions, or friends, over whom we can exert a controlling influence. We consider the time passed at the theatre as wasted; and the prodigious sums there expended as worse than thrown away. We regard the theatre, not only as a scene of dissipation, where serious subjects are forgotten, and the soul is unfitted for communion with its God, but as a school of profligacy, a fountain of corruption, from which the tide of ruin flows out in broad and desolating streams. Entertaining, in common with our Christian brethren generally, views such as these respecting the theatre, and presuming it to be well understood that such were our views, we have felt as though a formal expression of them was not necessary.

We are induced at this time to change our course, and offer a few remarks on the subject in question, chiefly for the purpose of congratulating our readers on the manifest change in public sentiment in regard to the theatre, which has been showing itself for a considerable time past. This change is apparent in the diminished attention now paid to the theatre. The time has been, when Boston was cursed with two or three of these haunts of wickedness, regularly open, and often thronged; but for the last year, there has been but one in operation, and this, we are told, not numerously attended, and with difficulty

supported. The time has been, when some of the most respectable people in Boston were accustomed to attend the theatre with their families ; but latterly not a few of this description, and these, too, not in our sense of the word decidedly religious, have withdrawn from it, we trust forever. The time has also been, when, to speak of the theatre as a nursery of vice, or even as of an immoral tendency, could hardly be tolerated in some professedly religious circles ; but in these same circles it is now denounced in no measured terms of reprobation. Whether the theatre has actually deteriorated, or whether the enormities of it are coming to be better understood and more deeply felt, we shall not take upon ourselves to determine ; but that it is regarded and spoken of by many in a manner very different from what it once was, is indubitable.—The Christian Examiner, in May last, used the following language respecting it :

“ It (the theatre) is indeed abused, and *so* abused, it is a fountain of so much ruin, it is the receptacle of such infamy—there is, as it seems to us, such a needless catering for the grossest appetites, there is such an unseemly and shocking vicinity of innocence with the most shameless corruption, that we can speak of the theatre, in its present state, only in terms of *utter reprobation*. We seriously think that good men ought to do something to purify this amusement, or to forsake it entirely.”

In the course of the last summer, a memorial, signed by many of the principal citizens of Boston, was presented to the Mayor and Aldermen, in which the following statements occur.

“ It has been known for a considerable time, that the third row in our theatres has become a disgusting scene of intemperance, profaneness, and licentiousness of manners ; and no doubt is entertained, that the sale of intoxicating liquors within the theatres, and especially in the third row, does much to aggravate, if it does not produce, the evils complained of.

“ Surely it cannot be generally known, what misery has been thence diffused through families, and how cruelly the honorable hopes of parents have been blasted, and forever, from that cause. What a place must that be, gentlemen, in which ten thousand dollars are annually expended, chiefly for intoxicating draughts ; and where a greater part of this sum is expended by minors, in the society of wanton and abandoned women ! What a reproach is it, in this Christian land, and in this city of Boston, that the permission to nourish prostitutes, and to corrupt and ruin the young, should proceed indirectly, from the sanction of public authority !”

On the last Sabbath in September, the Rev. Mr. Palfrey introduced the subject into a sermon, and brought it before his people, in a manner, we think, much to his credit.

“ I am safe in saying, that, when it has been asserted in respectable quarters, that the income of the many places of refreshment, so called, beneath that roof, (the theatre) is such as, along with other indications, proves that it could be furnished only by a vast amount of expensive sin ;—and that part of the building, moreover, has been the scene of the most odious practices,—that it appears to have been *not merely an introduction to the brothel, but a*

brothel itself,—it is safe to say, that it is time for the guardians of the young, and for all good citizens, to take the alarm, and ask if these things are so. And if they are so, or have been, or are in danger of being, I do not say that the time, for the magistrate to interpose, is this week, or this month, or this year, but I am sure that it is well for us to have the magistrate understand, that when the time does come, a virtuous community will sustain him in laying a strong hand on such abominations;—that, when he shall interfere, on an emergency so pressing, for the public safety, he will not be left to do it at any hazard or disadvantage.”

In reference to the passage above given, representing the theatre “to have been not merely an introduction to the brothel, but a brothel itself,” Mr. Palfrey remarks in a communication to the *Daily Advertiser*,

“Whoever is disposed, may find, on inquiry, that there have been arrangements of a room attached to a part of the theatre in question, which, considered together with the society customarily resorting to it, *prostitutes, pimps, liquor venders, rakes, and minors*, may seem to him, as they have seemed to others, to authorize a *presumption of the use intended*, stronger than most presumptions which the law enforces.”

In a letter to Mr. Palfrey, dated Oct. 4, the Hon. William Sullivan, speaking in the name of a Committee of which he was a member, in relation to the Tremont theatre, observes,

“They (the committee) were unwilling to be silent, when they supposed it even possible, that their sons, apprentices, and wards, hitherto unoffending and innocent, might be seduced to become, *first* spectators of iniquity, *then* partakers in it, and *finally* victims in a course of folly, leading to felonies, and to irretrievable ruin. If it is forbidden to parents, masters, guardians, and citizens, to take such peaceable and lawful measures, as they think proper, to save *the young* from folly, vice, and crime, it is time to shut up our school houses, and places of public worship, and leave the care and duty of moral instruction, to theatres.”

An anonymous writer in the *Daily Advertiser*, speaking on the same subject, says,

“During the last winter, the things that were done in a particular part of the theatre, and the agents by whom they were done, demanded an interference no less than a pestilence would.”—This is “a house which moral people will not much longer permit themselves to be seen in, unless some satisfactory changes occur.”

The testimony here furnished respecting the character of the theatre in Boston is full and explicit. Nothing can be added to it, and nothing, we presume, need be taken from it. We feel much obliged to the gentlemen by whom it is given, and can most cordially respond to the sentiments they have uttered, except, perhaps, in a single point. It appears on the face of most of these communications, that theatrical representations are not wrong in themselves, but only in their abuse; and that, if they could but be improved and reformed, they

might be a very commendable source of amusement. This plan of reforming the theatre has been a favorite one, with many people, for more than two thousand years. Still the theatre is not reformed; and the time, we think, has fully come, for the friends of morality to take the higher ground of saying that *it never can be*. It does not admit of being reformed, and still exists as a place of public resort and amusement. We might as well talk of reforming the fierce lion, or the ranging bear, and rendering the beast of prey a beast of burden: or of 'making a covenant with leviathan, to play with him as with a bird, and bind him for our maidens.' How are the nature and properties of an institution ever to be known, but by its invariable results? And where, from the first establishment of the theatre to the present hour, have not the results of it been uniformly unfavorable to the cause of virtue? Plato denounced it, in his day, as "dangerous to morality." Aristotle lays it down as a rule, "that the seeing of comedies ought to be forbidden to young people." Ovid advises Augustus to suppress this amusement, "as being a grand source of corruption." In the primitive Christian church, "both the players, and those who attended the theatre, were debarred from the sacraments." Archbishop Tillotson pronounces the playhouse to be "the devil's chapel," "a nursery of licentiousness and vice." Bishop Collier declares that "nothing had done more to debauch the age in which he lived, than the stage-poets and the playhouse." And even the infidel Rousseau, when it was proposed to establish a theatre in Geneva, wrote against it with much zeal and force, affirming that "every friend of morals ought to oppose it."

That the theatre does not admit of being reformed and purified, so as to exert a favorable influence on the morals of a community, is evident from the nature of the case. The virtuous part of society, in general, do not want this amusement for their pleasure or profit, other places of resort being more agreeable to them; and consequently *they* will not be at the expense of supporting it. The theatre, then, must depend for support, chiefly, on the vicious and unprincipled. And as it depends on these, it must be made agreeable to them; it must be adapted to their tastes and wishes. In other words, *it must be made a wicked place*. It ever has been so, and from the nature of the case, it ever must be. An advocate of the Tremont theatre admits, by implication, that if "the refreshment rooms" are taken away, it cannot probably be supported. We fully believe him. Take away from the theatre all the stimulants of the passions, all the incentives to vice and sin, and you take away most of the attractions of the place. With these removed, you take away nineteen twentieths, if not ninety-nine hundredths, of all those who at present frequent it. And when these have withdrawn, the doors are at once closed, and the institution dies. If there was the least prospect that those whose hearts are so much set on reforming the theatre could accomplish anything, we would "bid them God speed," as we should think this might be the most effectual method of stopping the whole concern. But we do not believe there is the least prospect of this. Occasional restraints may be imposed, and occasional outrages upon sobriety and decency may be suppressed; but they will soon make their appearance in other ways, till at length the moral sense of the community becomes hardened to them, the friends of order are discouraged, and they are suffered to remain and increase.

There obviously is but one course for those who wish well to the cause of religion to take in relation to the theatre, and that is, to desert it, and to lift their united voice against it. No peace nor truce should be made with it. These receptacles of infamy, those haunts of debauchery and crime, have been tolerated

long enough. These fountains of corruption have been wide open, pouring forth their polluting streams upon city and country, long enough. Let them be espoused and abandoned by all good people—by all the friends of religion and their country. And let the voice of an injured community be raised against them, never to be hushed but with their suppression and overthrow.

ON AMUSEMENTS.

From Bogue and Bennett's History of Dissenters.

“The following defence of abstinence from amusements, by a dissenter of the primitive stock and spirit, will give some idea of what those, who think with him, have to say in their own behalf. There was a large company, and the conversation turned on amusements. A decent old lady, who sat by him, knowing his sentiments, said to him, ‘Pray, sir, what harm can there be in cards, or an assembly, or in the theatre? I keep to my church, and the sacrament, and prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays; and if I spend two or three hours in an evening at the card-table, and carry my nephew and niece with me to our monthly assembly, and eight or ten times a year we go together to the play, you are a rigid man if you blame our conduct. Shew me where such things are forbidden in the word of God.’”

“Some were silent, but most of those who were present ranged themselves on her side, and with the exultation of triumph demanded the reasons for this queer opinion. Being thus pressed, he entered on the subject in his own vindication, and said, ‘You will, my friends, while I talk to you, carry this in your thoughts, that I confine my reasoning to Christians. That amusements will suit the taste of the people of the world, and be agreeable to their inclinations, and be, as it were, their heaven, is readily granted; and that, while they are under the dominion of earthly principles, they will not think these scenes of vanity unsuitable to their ideas of the Christian religion, nor incompatible with their profession of it. But that these amusements accord with the sentiments, pursuits, and engagements of a true Christian, I cannot assent. I must likewise insist that the character of a Christian be deduced entirely from the word of God, and not from the sentiments of the fashionable world: you must therefore weigh my reasoning in the balance of the sanctuary, not in the scales of human opinion. It is enjoined on a Christian, you know, not only that he should turn away with abhorrence from every sin, but that he should avoid every appearance of evil, and shun those things which are not of good report. And is not this the light in which such practices have been regarded by truly pious people, not in one sect of Christians, but in all; not merely in the present, but in every preceding age.’”

“Besides, if, for the sake of argument, it were granted that there is no positive evil in them, it will not be pretended that there is any

good, either in their nature or their tendency. But ought not every Christian to aspire after as exalted a measure of excellence of character as it is possible for him to attain? Ought he not to aim at presenting before the eyes of the world a pattern of purity and dignified goodness of the highest kind? But can you say that amusements conduce to so noble an end? Is it by them that such characters have been formed, or by them that they are sustained? The kings of France had no box at the theatre; it was conceived beneath their dignity to be there."

"But I have stronger accusations to bring. I charge all those amusements with producing a waste of precious time. How many hours of life are here consumed in what neither improves the mind, nor conduces to health. When relaxation is necessary, it may be found in exercises which, while they unbend the mind, enlarge its stores of useful knowledge, and giving vigor to the body, render it more fit for labor. But the waste of time by those who make these amusements a part of the plan of life is gravely to be considered: the number of hours consumed in such useless things will form a very serious and extensive article of what they must give an account, at the day of judgement."

"But I must charge them with a positive evil influence, and this is, in my mind, a more weighty objection against them. Are they not the common resort of the irreligious? Are these not, if their station will permit, to be found at the card-table, the assembly, and the theatre? Are not these their delight, their heaven? Will it be presumption to hint, that the fondness of such persons gives reason to suspect that there is something in them which is wrong, when you see them to be the universal resort of those who are not only destitute of religion, but under the influence of the worst principles, and addicted to the most vicious practices."

"How can you bear, madam, to herd with such companions? You, as well as myself, are advancing in life, and have been taught by experience to respect ourselves; and have a regard to the company which we keep. How then can you bear with such associates? But if submitting to the dishonor, and conceiving that you will receive no injury from their vicious principles, how can you introduce your nephew and niece into such society? They are in the bloom of life, when the heart is sensible of the faintest impression: the charms of conversation and manners which such sort of persons frequently possess (and it is all they can boast of,) will instil the poison of evil more certainly into the soul. In such company, they will soon learn to be ashamed of religion, and to blush at the idea of denying themselves, taking up their cross, and following Christ. A bias of an opposite nature is produced: dissipation of mind is the certain consequence, and levity of disposition, and the rank growth of appetites and passions unfavorable to the pure virtues of the heart, and to the innocence of the Christian character. The exercises of devotion lose all their relish; they dislike everything that is serious; and they soon afterwards dislike those who are lovers of seriousness. A new set of acquaintances is acquired, who displace the old; the grave and the wise make room for the thoughtless and the gay.

“Another very serious evil arising out of them is, that they indispose the mind for the common duties of life. Wherever there is a high relish for amusements, these duties become insipid; they are performed with reluctance as an irksome task; and the person longs for the conclusion of them, that he may betake himself to his joys. Where the mind is not thus perverted in its taste, the ordinary offices of life have pleasure blended with their performance, and this secures a continued attention to them through the whole of life. Whatever, therefore, banishes this pleasure, and converts an agreeable office into a painful drudgery, is an evil of no ordinary magnitude.

“It becomes you likewise very seriously to consider, that you are accountable for the example which you set before the world. That multitudes of young people, and some of maturer years, are involved in utter ruin by these amusements, and lose fortune, health, and present and future happiness in the pursuit, is too evident to be denied. But should any of them have been initiated in these vanities by your example and countenance, and emboldened in them by seeing you a patron and constant visitor at the card-table, the assembly, or the theatre, it may not be so easy to exculpate yourself from heinous guilt at the awful tribunal of God, as you now imagine.”

“That persons, who make any pretensions to eminence in piety, keep at the greatest distance from these scenes, and consider them as altogether unsuitable to their condition, you must allow. Nay, you must be sensible that to be seen there does not accord with your ideas of sanctity of character. What would be your sensations, if, on taking up a morning newspaper, you were to read the following paragraph: ‘Last night the apostle Paul, and the Evangelist Timothy were at the assembly. St. Paul played all the evening with two old matrons and a middle aged gentlemen at cards. Timothy danced with the young ladies, and charmed them all with his elegance, his wit, and his mirth.’ Would you not be shocked at the intelligence, as containing something abhorrent to the ideas which you had formed of those holy men? But is there more than one rule for the disciples of Christ? Is there a strict formulary and a lax one, designed for different classes of mankind? No, there is but one, and all should observe it in all its precepts; and you, and I, and every person professing Christianity, should be as good and holy as the apostles and evangelists, as Paul and Timothy were.”

“Not to be tedious, can you bear the idea of death finding you occupied in these amusements? To die, while engaged in your business; or in conversing with your family and friends; or in walking abroad in the fields; or in lying down on your couch to rest, has nothing unsuitable to the Christian character: it awakens no painful sensations as if the person had been surprized by death in an improper place. To die at church, or in family devotion, or in the closet at secret prayer, would be considered by you as according well with a Christian’s profession, and you would covet it as an honor, and say, ‘Let my last end be like his.’ But would you like to die at the card-table, in the midst of a dance, or in a box at the theatre? You would not: the idea shocks you? But why? There must be

something wrong, that excites such emotions in your breast. If you shudder at the thought of dying in your beloved amusements, it must be more than improper to live in them.

"Consider these hints. I will not press the subject farther. I only say, can you pray for the blessing of God upon them? You can do it for the exercises of religion; you can do it for your worldly business; but can you do it for these amusements? You cannot. Indulge no longer, my friends, in practices on which you cannot pray for the divine blessing.

"You may think the life of a person, who abstains from your favorite pleasures, dull and gloomy beyond enduring. This judgment, I know, is frequently passed on it by those who know no higher principles than the spirit of the world can infuse. 'How,' say they, 'can you, and those who think and act as you do, bear existence? Melancholy and misery must reside continually in your habitations.' No, this is an egregious mistake. It is a poor miserable life that depends for its happiness on cards, and dancing, and plays. After bidding adieu to them all, we have enough behind for comfort and happiness; the banishing your amusements heightens our felicity. There remain with us the pursuits of literature, the charms of agreeable conversation, the satisfaction and quiet peace arising out of the performance of our every day's duties, the delights of relative affection in domestic intercourse, which are to be reckoned among the sweetest joys of life; delights, which your amusements tend to lessen and destroy; and above all, the still superior pleasures of religious worship and devotion. From these sources we derive our happiness, and these ingredients, thrown into the cup of life, render it sweet and pleasing to our taste."

EXTRACT FROM DR. ADAM SMITH.

THE following extract from Dr. Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, pp. 157—160, exhibits the views of this distinguished philosopher on some very important moral subjects, such as the nature of virtue, the insufficiency of human merit, and our need of an atonement. Possibly some may be induced to listen to him, who would not regard the instructions of a professed minister of Christ.

"That the Deity loves virtue and hates vice, as a voluptuous man loves riches and hates poverty, not for their own sakes, but for the effects which they tend to produce; that he loves the one, only because it promotes the happiness of society, which his benevolence prompts him to desire; and that he hates the other, only because it occasions the misery of mankind, which the same divine quality renders the object of his aversion; is not the doctrine of untaught nature, but of an artificial refinement of reason and philosophy. Our untaught natural sentiments all prompt us to believe, that

as perfect virtue is supposed necessarily to appear to the Deity, as it does to us, for its own sake, and without any further view, the natural and proper object of love and reward; so must vice, of hatred and punishment. That the gods neither resent nor hurt, was the general maxim of all the sects of the ancient philosophy; and if, by resenting, be understood, that violent and disorderly perturbation, which often distracts and confounds the human breast; or if, by hurting, be understood, the doing mischief wantonly, and without regard to propriety or justice, such weakness is undoubtedly unworthy of the divine perfection. But if it be meant, that vice does not appear to the Deity to be, for its own sake, the object of abhorrence and aversion, and what, for its own sake, it is fit and right should be punished; the truth of this maxim seems repugnant to some very natural feelings. If we consult our natural sentiments, we are even apt to fear, lest, before the holiness of God, vice should appear to be more worthy of punishment, than the weakness and imperfection of human virtue can ever seem to be of reward. Man, when about to appear before a Being of infinite perfection, can feel but little confidence in his own merit, or in the imperfect propriety of his own conduct. If the presence of his fellow-creatures, he may even justly elevate himself, and may often have reason to think highly of his own character and conduct, compared to the still greater imperfection of theirs. But the case is quite different, when about to appear before his infinite Creator. To such a Being, he fears, that his littleness and weakness can scarce ever appear the proper object, either of esteem or of reward. But he can easily conceive, how the numberless violations of duty, of which he has been guilty, should render him the proper object of aversion and punishment; and he thinks he can see no reason why the divine indignation should not be let loose, without any restraint, upon so vile an insect as he imagines that he himself must appear to be. If he would still hope for happiness, he suspects that he cannot demand it from the justice, but that he must entreat it from the mercy of God. Repentance, sorrow, humiliation, contrition at the thought of his past conduct, seem, upon this account, the sentiments which become him, and to be the only means which he has left for appeasing that wrath which he knows he has justly provoked. He even distrusts the efficacy of all these, and naturally fears, lest the wisdom of God should not, like the weakness of man, be prevailed upon to spare the crime, by the most importunate lamentations of the criminal. Some other intercession, some other sacrifice, some other atonement, he imagines must be made for him, beyond what he himself is capable of making, before the purity of the divine justice can be reconciled to his manifold offences. The doctrines of revelation coincide in every respect with these original anticipations of nature; and, as they teach us how little we can depend upon the imperfection of our own virtue, so they show us, at the same time, that the most powerful intercession has been made, and that the most dreadful atonement has been paid, for our manifold transgressions and iniquities."

THE UNITARIAN ADVOCATE.

THE conductors of this Periodical, in their number for October, continue their remarks on Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing, and call the attention of their readers, first, to the subject of 'Ecclesiastical tribunals;' and secondly, to the objections which have been made to some recent Judicial decisions, touching the rights of the churches.

In the Letter of Mr. Stuart, Dr. Channing was quoted as follows.

"We are now threatened with new tribunals, or Consociations, whose office it will be to try ministers for their errors, to inspect the churches, and to advise and assist them in the extirpation of 'heresy.' Whilst the laity are slumbering, the ancient and free constitution of our churches is silently undermined, and is crumbling away. Since argument is insufficient to produce uniformity of opinion, recourse must be had to more powerful instruments of conviction; I mean, to ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS."

"It is a melancholy fact, that our long established form of Congregational church government is menaced, and TRIBUNALS *unknown to our churches*,—are to be introduced for the very purpose, that the supposed errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians may be tried and punished as heresies; that is, AS CRIMES."

The allegations in these quotations are among those which Mr. Stuart declares untrue, and from which he undertakes to vindicate himself and his Orthodox brethren. The conductors of the Advocate admit that the Orthodox have not *now* "any intention of introducing such tribunals amongst us," but insist that in 1815, the time when Dr. Channing first preferred these charges, an attempt of this nature was actually made; and they remark, at length, on the proposals then under consideration by the General Association of Massachusetts for a Consociation of the churches.* In reply to their remarks, it is proposed to consider the two following inquiries:

I. Were the Consociations, at that time proposed, such tribunals as those described by Dr. Channing? And

II. How was the proposal for a Consociation of the churches regarded and treated by the Orthodox clergy of the State?

To the first of these inquiries, we answer, without hesitation, in the negative. Dr. Channing says, "Our long established form of Congregational church government is menaced, and tribunals *unknown to our churches* are to be introduced." But Consociation was not "unknown to our churches." "The principles for it were explicitly set forth, in distinct propositions, by the venerable Synod,

* The conductors of the Advocate suppose that Professor Stuart must have forgotten these proposals for Consociation when he wrote his Letter to Dr. Channing, and, in a strain of affected sportiveness and triumph, they endeavor to assist his recollections on the subject. Now there is not the least reason to suppose that the proposals for Consociation were forgotten by Mr. Stuart. They could not have been forgotten. He quotes Dr. Channing speaking of "Consociations" by name. He might have a perfect recollection of all that was said and done on the subject of Consociations, and yet have no knowledge of any such tribunals for the trial and punishment of heretics, as Dr. Channing says the churches were threatened with.

composed of the elders and messengers of the churches, and holden at Boston in 1662." These propositions, prepared in many instances by the same individuals who, only fourteen years before, assisted in framing the Cambridge Platform, were incorporated in the Report made to the General Association in 1815, and were spoken of by the Committee who presented that Report as "especially suitable to be adopted; as a Consociation, founded upon them, and consistent with them, can be no innovation, but *a recurrence to first principles, a restoration of our churches to their primitive order.*"—Again, proposals for a Consociation of the churches in Massachusetts were made to the Convention of Congregational Ministers in May, 1706, and received the sanction of that body. In 1716, Dr. Increase Mather published his "Disquisition concerning Ecclesiastical Councils," in which he strongly urges Consociation, in the very form in which it was proposed in 1815, as a measure "not only lawful, but *absolutely necessary* for the establishment of the churches."—The public will judge, therefore, whether the Consociations proposed in 1815 were, as Dr. Channing alleges, *unknown* to the churches of Massachusetts—a thing of which they had never before heard, and concerning which they had no knowledge.

But "our long established form of Congregational church government is *menaced*," &c. This implies two things; first, that the Consociations were, in case of refusal or reluctance, to be *forced* upon the churches; for we do not *menace* a man with that which is only offered him, and which he is free to accept or decline; and, secondly, that they are inconsistent with "Congregational church government." But so far were the proposals of 1815 from attempting to *force* Consociations on the churches, it was expressly provided, in one of the articles, that "no church can rightfully be considered or treated as belonging to a Consociation *without its own voluntary consent*, or restrained from regularly withdrawing itself from a Consociation *whenever it shall see fit to withdraw.*"

As to Consociations being inconsistent with "Congregational church government," we have several remarks to offer. In the first place, it is very strange that the venerable men who planted the Congregational churches of Massachusetts and framed the Platform, should, only fourteen years after, publish a set of propositions, entirely inconsistent with the plan of government which they had previously adopted. Yet, as has been shown, the propositions, published and agreed on in 1662, were made "the basis" of the plan of Consociation proposed in 1815.—It is strange, too, that Doctors Increase and Cotton Mather, than whom no men better understood the constitution of our churches, or more highly valued it, should urge the adoption of a measure, which went to subvert and destroy this constitution. Yet they did urge the adoption of Consociation, in the same general form which they were made to assume in the proposals of 1815.—It is also strange, that the Congregational churches of Connecticut should continue and flourish, for than a hundred and twenty years, under the influence of a system at war with the first principles of Congregationalism. Yet they have continued and flourished, during all this period, in a consociated state.

In view of these facts, it may well be asked, What is there in a Consociation of Churches, inconsistent with the principles of Congregational government? A Consociation of churches is merely an agreement, voluntarily entered into by a convenient number of contiguous churches, that they will help to bear each other's burthens, and watch over one another in faithfulness and love; that they will mutually afford and accept counsel and aid in all cases of doubt and difficulty; and, in short, that they will walk together in a holy fellowship, according to some previously adopted rules. Now in all this we see nothing inconsistent with any principles of Congregational government. It is not inconsistent with such principles for a church to call a *Council*, when one is thought to be needed. But a Consociation is no other than a standing Council, previously agreed on, to be summoned together when a necessity occurs.* A Congregational church, said our fathers, "hath full power and authority within itself regularly to administer all the ordinances of Christ, and is not under any other ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatsoever." But a body possessing originally all this power may delegate some portion of it, if it pleases—to a mutual Council, to a Board of reference, or to a Consociation; and may again resume it, if it shall be abused. It is not inconsistent with the freedom of a people, or with their sovereignty, in a *civil* sense, that they choose to delegate a portion of their power. And no more is a delegation of ecclesiastical power inconsistent with the freedom and independence of the churches. In the proposals for Consociation, published in 1815, it is stated expressly, "that it will not be competent to the Consociation to *hinder* the exercise of the power delegated by Christ to each particular church, in regard to its own interior administrations and concerns, but by counsel from the word of God to *direct and strengthen the same*, upon all just occasions."

It is further alleged by Dr. Channing that these "tribunals are to be introduced for the *very purpose*, that the supposed errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians may be tried and punished as heresies; that is, as crimes." But this, instead of being "the *very purpose*" for which Consociations were proposed in 1815, constituted, so far as appears, no part of the purpose. Nothing is said or intimated in the proposals then made about "the errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians being tried and punished as crimes," and there is no evidence that any such idea ever entered the minds of the Committee by whom these proposals were reported. Indeed, there is abundant evidence that no such thought could have entered their minds. It is provided, in one of the articles, that the connected churches "agree to hold the Consociation as the proper body" [instead of selecting a Council for the purpose] "to hear and decide upon any complaint or allegation, touching *ministerial character*, against any minister belonging to it, to acquit, or to find guilty, to advise, sustain, or depose, as the case

* In one of the Articles proposed in 1815, is contained the following provision: "The consociated churches with their Pastors agree to regard and use the particular Consociation to which they belong as the *proper Council*, made mutual by this agreement, as to all parties concerned, to be applied to by the churches and individuals in the connexion, in all cases in which the advice and assistance of a Council is requisite."

may require." But here is nothing about trying and punishing heretics as criminals—nothing which may not be done, and which has not frequently been done, by mutual Councils, under the present organization of our churches.

Let it not be understood from anything here said, that we are in favor of Consociations, or that we desire to see the churches of this Commonwealth consociated. Such an order of things may be expedient, or it may not be; we touch not that question. The churches have a right to consider and judge of the matter as they please.—Our single object has been to show, that the Consociations, proposed in 1815, have no resemblance to the "tribunals" described by Dr. Channing, and consequently furnish no colorable ground for the allegations he has made. He describes "tribunals unknown to our churches," whereas Consociations had long been known to them. He describes something with which the churches were "*menaced*;" whereas Consociations, had the proposals for them been approved, would only have been offered to the churches, to be received or rejected, as they thought best. He describes something inconsistent with "Congregational church government;" but Consociations are entirely consistent with such government. He describes "tribunals to be introduced, for the *very purpose*" of trying and punishing heretics as criminals; but the Consociations, proposed in 1815, contemplate no such object as this. Where then is the resemblance between the two? And how little reason did the proposal for Consociations furnish, for the sweeping charges which have been made to grow out of it?

We were to inquire, in the second place, how the proposals for a Consociation of the churches, of which so much has been said, were regarded and treated by the Orthodox clergy. It has been commonly represented by Unitarians, that these proposals originated with this body of men, and were regarded by them with great complacency. 'They intended and expected to fasten them on the churches, and to make them the instrument of embarrassing and removing every minister who could not enter into their views. But by the vigilance and exertions of their opponents, the people were led to take the alarm, and the whole project was mercifully defeated.' He can have had but little acquaintance with leading Unitarians, or their works, who does not know that this is the manner in which they have usually spoken of this subject; but no representation, certainly, could be more unfounded.—In the summer of 1814, the plan of Consociation, approved and confirmed by the Convention of Congregational Ministers in 1706, was submitted to the General Association of Massachusetts. A Committee was appointed to consider the same, and report the next year. The next year they did report, and their report was ordered to "be printed, and copies sent to the several Associations, for the purpose of ascertaining the public sentiment respecting the plan of ecclesiastical order therein presented." At the next meeting, in 1816, the subject was called up, and finally disposed of. In what manner? By adopting the proposals for Consociation, and forcing them upon the reluctant churches? No, but by leaving the churches to do just as they pleased. "The Association *wish not to prescribe opinions to their brethren*, neither

would they recommend any reform to be made in the church, otherwise than in conscientious obedience to its Supreme Head. They believe that the Report of the Committee" (proposing Consociations) "accords in its general principles, with the examples and precepts of the New Testament; and in those parts of the Commonwealth, in which the sentiments of ministers and churches are *favorable to its adoption*, this Association have *no objection* against their proceeding immediately to organize themselves into Consociations, upon the general principles of said Report."

The truth of the case, in few words, is this: the plan for consociating the churches of Massachusetts, which was first attempted in 1662, and again by the Mathers in the early part of the next century, was brought forward, the third time, by individuals of the clergy, in 1814. The proposal was made to a body of Orthodox ministers, and never went beyond these ministers. It was never submitted to the churches, or to the people, so far as we know, in a single instance. The result was, that the clergy, after much consideration, did not think proper to urge its adoption. They waived the whole subject by saying, that if the churches in any part of the State wished to consociate, they had no objection. The plan of consociating the churches, therefore, whether good or bad, was put to rest, not by the people, not by the churches, not by Unitarians, (whose opposition weighed not a feather in the minds of those to whom the subject was submitted) but solely THROUGH THE INFLUENCE OF THE ORTHODOX CLERGY.

We say these things, not because we are anxious that our clergy should have the credit of this measure, if any credit belongs to it; but because what we have stated is the truth, and truth which ought to be known and understood. This is a subject on which Unitarians have vaped, and boasted, and accused and censured those who deserve no censure, long enough. It is time that it should be explained, and set in a proper light; and we are much obliged to our neighbors of the Advocate for affording us so favorable an opportunity of introducing it to the consideration of our readers.

The other subject, to which the conductors of the Advocate call the attention of their readers, is despatched by them in few words; and we shall not need to employ many in reply. That we have objected to certain decisions of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, affecting the interests of our churches, (as every citizen who thinks with us has an undoubted right to do,) is certain. We have not called in question the ability of the Judges, much less their integrity: but as some Unitarians say of "the writers of the books of Scripture," we think them "men, and therefore fallible." In the Report of the decision of the Dedham case, we are sure that important *historical facts*, of which we can judge as well as lawyers, are greatly misrepresented. We are sure, also, that the Chief Justice did travel out of his professional sphere, and go into a discussion of theological questions. Is not the question respecting the proper qualifications for communion at the Lord's table a theological question? one which has been agitated by theologians in this country for more than a hundred years, and is still unsettled? And did not Chief

Justice Parker go into a consideration of this question, on the bench, and express officially an opinion respecting it? We know, too, that the decision, to which we have referred, is inconsistent, in several points, with others on the same subject which preceded it, and inconsistent with itself; for we have examined it to our entire satisfaction, as any person of ordinary capacity can do at pleasure. See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. i. pp. 131—137.

The writer in the *Advocate* represents our opposition to this decision as “for the most part unsuccessful,” and doubts the assertion of one of our correspondents, that it “has never been well received, or acquiesced in, by the bar, or by intelligent lawyers of the Commonwealth.* We could easily remove his doubts on this subject, were it needful or proper to do so. We could refer him to lawyers and jurists not a few, of high respectability, both in the state and out of it, with whose opinions we have been made acquainted, and whom we *know* to be entirely dissatisfied with the principles laid down in the Dedham decision. We could name many such, who think as we do, that the churches are corporate bodies, entitled to their own property, and capable of holding it, and that to wrest it from them, under cover of law, is no better than plunder. What possible right has a parish, in case of division, to the records, the communion furniture, and other property of the church? They did not purchase such property, nor was it given to them; and they have, in justice, no more claim to it, than they have to the houses and lands of the church members. In regard to decisions, making such a disposal of church property, we repeat the language of another correspondent, “*They have not been generally acquiesced in, and will not be.*”

“To be sure there has been, and we trust there will be, no violent resistance; but between a mere abstaining from such resistance, and cordial acquiescence, there is a very wide difference. And it is high time that our honorable Judges were given distinctly to understand, that, however much professing Christians throughout the State are disposed to respect them as magistrates and as men, and however ready they may be to sustain them in the distribution of justice, still they cannot look on, and see church after church, which the Pilgrims planted, and which God has blessed, stripped of its natural

* This writer has inserted a long note, in which he complains of some inaccuracies in the communication from which the sentence above quoted is taken. See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. ii. p. 128. We have had no opportunity of conferring with our correspondent, or of learning from any source, precisely what the facts in the case are. The writer of the article in the *Advocate*, (if report attributes it to its real author) undoubtedly knows what they are, and we are willing to presume that he has stated them correctly. What then is the amount of misrepresentation charged upon our correspondent? Why, that a *deacon* (not deacons) was removed from office by Mr. Lamson's church; and he not (as our correspondent had understood) without previous notice and accusation. It gives us pleasure to correct any, the least, mis-statement of this sort, into which ourselves or our correspondents may at any time fall. If others approve our example in this respect, we hope they will follow it. In a single article on the rights of the churches, published in our number for July 1829, we pointed out more than forty misrepresentations in the *Reviews* in the *Christian Examiner* on the same subject. Not one of them has yet been so much as noticed.—It would seem that Unitarians were more civil to their refractory deacons a dozen years ago, than they have been recently; as it is stated positively that the Juridicals in Cambridge did undertake to remove their deacons, without previous notice, or the allegation of a crime.

rights, and its just inheritance, without *deep emotion*. We ask no more for the churches than what obviously belongs to them, the right of self-preservation, of self-organization, of controlling their own property, and managing, generally, their own concerns; and when this is refused them, whether under color of law, or in face of law, (though we can *keep the peace*,) we cannot, without treachery to Him whose are all the churches, cordially acquiesce. And in saying this, we are confident that we speak the sentiment of thousands, and of tens of thousands among the most pious and respectable citizens of this Commonwealth."

Our opponents compliment themselves and one another continually, on the fair, mild, and charitable spirit in which they are wont to conduct their religious discussions. We must furnish our readers with a single specimen, from which to judge of the propriety of such representations.

"There are strange delusions in the world. The Orthodox may oppress, denounce and vilify, and no injustice, in their opinion, is done. They are authorized to trample the 'world's people,' heretics, and infidels, for so Unitarians are called, under their feet; and all this time, Unitarians are expected to be still; they cannot utter a word of rebuke or remonstrance, but they must be chastised for it. 'When Hagar offends her mistress, this is downright rebellion; when Sarah beats Hagar this is due correction.' So, according to the 'lively' Jortin, the Orthodox have thought, taking Sarah and Hagar for 'types' of themselves, and of heretics. And so they appear to think now. They being the 'true seed,' 'chosen,' and 'saints,' are at liberty to administer correction to Unitarian outcasts and reprobates. The blows they give are 'sanctified by the good intention, and the salutary effect.'"

If the gentleman who wrote, and those who approved and published this paragraph, *think* that the statements contained in it are fair and true, and the spirit manifested, kind and charitable; we sincerely pity them. They are entitled, in this case, to the *commiseration* of all sober, enlightened men. If, on the other hand, they were willing to publish such statements, when they *did not think them true*; we can only leave them to their own reflections.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Christian Student*: Designed to assist Christians in general in acquiring Religious Knowledge. With a list of books suitable for a Minister's library. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth, Minister of Sir George Wheler's Chapel, Spital Square. From the second London edition. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830. pp. 362.

2. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Andrew Fuller*, late pastor of the Baptist Church at Kettering, and first Secretary to the Baptist Missionary Society. By J. W. Morris. First American from the last London edition. Edited by Rufus Babcock, Jr. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1830. pp. 320.

3. *Exegetical Essays on several words relating to Future Punishment.* By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Andover: Flagg & Gould. 1830. pp. 156.

The first of these Essays is an examination of the Scriptural use of the words *Aion* and *Aiorios*, and was published in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for August 1829. The others contain a similar examination of the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartaros*, and *Geenna*. The following passages are from the General Remarks, with which the learned author closes his investigation.

"And now, in view of the results which the whole of the preceding investigations afford, what says the understanding? What says conscience?"

"The question is not, what this or that individual may *wish* or *desire* to be true; but, *What have the sacred writers taught?*"

"Our question is with the *Bible*. Does this reveal a *place* of future punishment? To say that this is absurd, or impossible, is only to prejudge the question without examining it. The results of a *philological* examination of the Scriptures, are, that a place of punishment after death is disclosed by the sacred writers, and by the Saviour of men. I am well aware that this is contradicted and denied. But then, neither contradiction nor denial, in this case, springs from *philology*, but from inclination, wishes, philosophy, or prejudice. If this be not so, why is not philology arrayed, in all its proper strength, against the idea that there is a place of future punishment? Who has done this? How is it to be done? All the examples in the Scriptures, of the various words above examined, are produced in these essays. There is no concealment. I trust there is no attempt to pervert or fritter away their obvious meaning. I am certain there is no such design, on my part. Let them be philologically and critically set aside, or shown to be erroneously interpreted, and, so far as I am concerned, I promise to institute *de novo* another examination."

"I advance one step further. There is not only a place of future punishment, (just as surely as there is of future happiness, and on the like grounds,) but that place is separated by an "impassable gulf" from the region of the blessed. So the awful passage in Luke xvi. 19—26 informs us. The words of this passage, be it remembered, are those of the Saviour, who knows whether there is a hell as well as a heaven. They then that "would pass from the Hades of torments to the region of the blessed, CANNOT." (Luke xvi. 26.) There is no commutation of place for them.

"The force of all this may be denied; attempts may be made to fritter it away; they have been. There is no difficulty in all this. But how the IMPASSABLE GULF fixed between heaven and hell by an ALMIGHTY GOD, is to be removed, or rendered *passible*, is a question which those who deal thus with the Saviour's words, would do well seriously and timely to consider."

4. *The Spiritual Mirror, or Looking Glass*; exhibiting the Human Heart as being either the Temple of God, or a habitation of Devils: Exemplified by a series of ten engravings, intended to aid in a better understanding of Man's Fallen Nature. Translated from the German, by Peter Bauder. Newburyport: Charles Whipple. 1830. pp. 80.

5. *The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion.* By James Douglass, Esq. First American from the second Edinburgh edition. Hartford: Cook & Co., and Packard & Butler. 1830. pp. 315.

6. *A Lexicon of Useful Knowledge*; for the use of Schools and Libraries. With several hundred engravings. By Rev. H. Wilbur, A. M. New York: White, Gallaher & White. 1830.

7. *The Triumph of Christ's Enemies no cause of Discouragement.* A Sermon delivered at Winthrop, June 21, 1830, on the evening previous to the meeting of the General Conference of Maine. By Silas McKeen, Pastor of the Congregational Church in Bradford, Vermont. Portland: Shirley & Hyde. pp. 26.

8. *An Address to the Citizens of Boston*, September 17th, 1830, the close of the second Century from the first settlement of the City. By Josiah Quincy, LL. D., President of Harvard University. Boston: J. H. Eastburn. pp. 68.

Of this learned and eloquent Address, the following are the closing passages :

"What then, in conclusion of this great topic, are the elements of the liberty, prosperity and safety, which the inhabitants of New England at this day enjoy? In what language, and concerning what comprehensive truths, does the wisdom of former times address the inexperience of the future?"

"Those elements are simple, obvious, and familiar.

"Every civil and religious blessing of New England, all that here gives happiness to human life, or security to human virtue, is alone to be perpetuated in the forms and under the auspices of a free commonwealth.

"The commonwealth itself has no other strength or hope, than the intelligence and virtue of the individuals that compose it.

"For the intelligence and virtue of individuals, there is no other human assurance than laws, providing for the education of the whole people.

"These laws themselves have no strength, or efficient sanction, except in the moral and accountable nature of man, disclosed in the records of the Christian's faith; the right to read, to construe, and to judge concerning which, belongs to no class or cast of men, but exclusively to the individual, who must stand or fall by his own acts and his own faith, and not by those of another.

"The great comprehensive truths, written in letters of living light on every page of our history,—the language addressed by every past age of New England to all future ages is this;—*Human happiness has no perfect security but freedom;—freedom none but virtue;—virtue none but knowledge; and neither freedom, nor virtue, nor knowledge has any vigor, or immortal hope, except in the principles of the Christian faith, and in the sanctions of the Christian religion.*

"Men of Massachusetts! Citizens of Boston! descendants of the early emigrants! consider your blessings; consider your duties. You have an inheritance acquired by the labors and sufferings of six successive generations of ancestors. They founded the fabric of your prosperity, in a severe and masculine morality, having intelligence for its cement, and religion for its ground-work. Continue to build on the same foundation, and by the same principles; let the extending temple of your country's freedom rise, in the spirit of ancient times, in proportions of intellectual and moral architecture,—just, simple, and sublime. As from the first to this day, let New England continue to be an example to the world, of the blessings of a free government, and of the means and capacity of man to maintain it. And, in all times to come, as in all times past, may Boston be among the foremost and the boldest to exemplify and uphold whatever constitutes the prosperity, the happiness, and the glory of New England."

9. *An Ode*, pronounced before the inhabitants of Boston, Sept. 17th, 1830, at the Centennial Celebration of the Settlement of the City. By Charles Sprague. Boston: J. H. Eastburn. pp. 22.

10. *An Address* to the members of the City Council, on the Removal of the Municipal Government to the Old State House. By Harrison Gray Otis, Mayor of the City of Boston. Boston: J. H. Eastburn. pp. 15.

THE
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. III.

DECEMBER, 1830.

NO. 12.

COMMUNICATIONS.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN CALVIN.

(Continued from p. 567.)

I AM confident, that in the foregoing rapid sketch, every serious and candid reader must discover the lineaments of a mind, at once penetrating, active, vigorous and steady to its high purpose, together with indubitable evidence of learning, sincerity, piety, and ardent attachment to the great principles of the reformation. But I have purposely reserved a few additional remarks for the close of the present sketch. If in our final estimate of this great reformer's character, we could truly present it to the world without a blemish, it would stand alone upon the annals of the church. Infirmities and imperfections Calvin undoubtedly had, and few men have more deeply felt and lamented them than he did. He lived in a comparatively dark age ; and although he saw many things more clearly than his cotemporaries, we have to lament, much more than to wonder, that his mind was not wholly emancipated from the intolerance which every where surrounded him. I allude here, particularly, to that unhappy incident, which has been most ungenerously seized upon, magnified, distorted, and employed to hold up the Genevan Reformer, in the character of a cruel and relentless persecutor. In order to blast the character of Calvin, and to expose to general reprobation that system of doctrines which bears his name, a thousand changes have been rung upon the sufferings of that audacious blasphemer, who was burnt at Geneva, in 1553.

Servetus—yes, alas ! Servetus *was* condemned and executed for blasphemy and heresy ; and the wonder is with many, how any one can possibly embrace and defend doctrines, which were taught by the man, who it is said, was the principal actor in that horrible tragedy ! Indeed, if the modern Calvinists had actually assem-

bled from all parts of the christian world, to express their full approbation of the measures which brought Servetus to the stake, they could hardly have identified themselves more perfectly with Calvin, in that transaction, than they are now virtually represented to be, in hostile magazines, tracts, newspaper-paragraphs, and itinerant declamations. But why so much pains to visit the iniquities of Calvin, whatever they may have been, upon the heads of the present, or any other generation of his followers ?

For my own part, I am utterly unable to reconcile this visitation, with any notions I can form of distributive justice. What if Calvin had personally sat in judgement upon Servetus, or even with his own hand lighted the fire which consumed him ? Would that have destroyed the whole system of doctrines which he taught ? Would it have made it criminal for any body, in after times, to think and preach as he did ? The religious opinions of Luther, Calvin, Arminius, Wesley, and other distinguished men, upon the cardinal doctrines of the Bible, are entirely distinct from their private characters, whatever they may have been. We may embrace their sentiments, without undertaking to justify every thing they did ; or we may admire them, as men and as Christians, without adopting their particular religious views.

It would be scarcely less uncandid, to make the whole Episcopal church of the present day answerable for the burning of Joan of Kent, by Cranmer, in the reign of Edward Sixth ; or to attach the odium of imprisoning *Christian David*, by Socinus, to all his present followers, than it is to make the Calvinists bear the reproach of what was done by others, at Geneva, almost three hundred years ago.

Bet to return to Calvin himself. Would he have merited the hundredth part of what has been said against him, even if he had been far more active than he was, in procuring the death of Servetus ? Was David a reprobate,—did all his piety stand for nothing, because he sinned in the matter of Uriah ? Was Peter a perjured hypocrite, because he denied his Lord with an oath ? Was Cranmer a vindictive and bloody persecutor, and is he to be excluded from christian charity, because he procured the death of the unhappy Joan of Kent ? Surely not : and why, then, should the Genevan Reformer have so many terms of reprobation heaped upon his memory, on account of his supposed active and zealous agency in the burning of Servetus ?

But a great mass of evidence might be brought forward, which, if it does not acquit Calvin altogether, exposes the calumny of his enemies in a strong light, and wipes away much of the reproach which even his friends have been made to believe rested upon his name.

Michael Servetus, then, who has been adorned by the enemies of Calvin with all the virtues of a primitive martyr—not to say can-

onized, in all the blazonry of a Romish legend, was an outrageous and incorrigible blasphemer of the Godhead ;—having in more than a hundred places, say the ministers of Geneva, boldly called the triune God, *a triple headed Cerberus—a phantom of devils—a Geryon monster—an illusion of Satan, and the like.* When interrogated on his trial before the Senate of Geneva, he declared, that all things were full of God ; and said, “ I doubt not but this bench and whatever you see is the substance of God.” “ When it was objected, then the devil will be substantially God, he burst into a deriding laugh, and said, ‘ This is my general principle—all things spring from the stock of God, and all nature is the substantial Spirit of God’ ?”

Such were the opinions of the unhappy Servetus, industriously promulgated for many years, both in his writings and conversation, wherever he could find either readers or hearers. Now we do not say, that, open and pertinacious as he was in his blasphemies, it was right to visit them with burning, or any other capital punishment. Far from it. We abhor religious persecution in every form. Nor can we ever cease to lament the intolerance which brought him to the stake. But it was the intolerance of a comparatively dark age, and not the cold malignity of either public, or private animosity. We mourn to think, that Calvin had any concern whatever, in the prosecution which brought Servetus to an untimely end ; but there was nothing of that atrocity in the part he acted, with which his enemies have so industriously labored to load his memory. He had no such agency in procuring the death of Servetus, as has been often ascribed to him ; and in what he did, there is not a particle of evidence, that he was actuated by personal animosity ; but every reason to believe, that he thought it his duty to put a stop, if possible, to the blasphemies of a man, who was pouring derision upon the most sacred things, and industriously disseminating his principles wherever he went.

It is true, we lament to say, that when Servetus, whose character and principles had long been known, went to Geneva, Calvin took measures to have him arrested, and assisted in preferring charges against him before the Senate. Thus much he thought the existing laws of the Canton required of him, as a free citizen, and thus much he doubtless felt conscientiously bound to do, as a minister of Christ, for the preservation of the pure doctrines of the Gospel. But *it is not true* that he pursued Servetus with the malignant spirit of persecution. *It is not true* that his influence at that time preponderated in the Senate of Geneva, by which body Servetus was sentenced to suffer death.* *It is not true* that Cal-

* “ A majority of the Senate at this time were under the influence of Perrin and the Bertelier faction (the enemies of Calvin) as appears from the fact, that in August and September of this year, the Senate voted, in face of Calvin and the consistory, that Bertelier, who had been excommunicated, should be admitted to the Lord’s Supper.” See Waterman’s Life of Calvin, p. 124.

vin burnt Servetus, or that he wished to have him punished in this cruel manner, or indeed in any other ; or that he was present when the dreadful sentence was executed. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence, that Calvin earnestly wished to save the life of Servetus, by persuading him to recant his errors,—that he persisted in his endeavors against torrents of abuse and blasphemies from the infatuated object of his solicitations ; and that after the sentence of burning was pronounced, he interceded with the Senate, though without effect, for a mitigation in the mode of punishment.*

My object is not to justify the tragical end of Servetus, which I as strongly disapprove, and as heartily lament, as the bitterest enemies of Calvinism can do ; but it is due to the cause of truth and justice to rescue the memory of the Genevan Reformer from the virulence and ignorance of anonymous calumniators. Persecution was the fault of the age in which he lived. In him, it evidently was a mistaken zeal for the preservation of true religion, and not the clear-sighted malignity of a relentless persecutor. It was the error of the best men of that period, just emerging as they all were from the darkness of Popery, and never, probably, having heard the right of punishing heretics seriously called in question. In proof of this, a long list of names might be given, including the most heroic confessors and brightest ornaments of the sixteenth century—such as Melancton, Urbanus Regius, Bucer, Capito, Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Farel, Beza, Cranmer, and the Pastors of Zurich. It is moreover worthy of particular observation, that for more than fifty years after the death of Calvin, no respectable writer of any sect can be found, who censures him for the part he took against Servetus.

Maimbourgh, a bitter enemy of the Reformation, and who himself wrote a history of Calvinism, with all his popish partialities and misrepresentations, says nothing on the affair of Servetus. *Dupin*, another bigoted papist, and author of an elaborate Ecclesiastical History, does not even name Servetus in his life of Calvin. Nor does the learned *Bayle*, who, from his principles, or rather from his want of principle, would have felt no reluctance in casting a stigma upon the character of the Genevan Reformer. And even *Bolseck*, who wrote a life of Calvin for the express purpose of blasting his name, no where accuses him of hatred to Servetus, nor blames him for any thing connected with the prosecution and death of that unhappy man. “The pious and excellent *Bishop Hall* solemnly pronounced, that, in that transaction relative to Servetus, Calvin did well approve himself to God’s Church.” *Heylin*, though in his History of Presbyterianism he inveighs bit-

* “We endeavored to commute the kind of death, but in vain. Why we could effect nothing in his favor, I will inform you at our interview.” Calvin to Farel.

terly against Calvin, never reproaches him as the persecutor of Servetus, which he would not have failed to do, had the conduct of the Reformer in that affair been thought reprehensible. 'Even the learned and pious *Turretin*, in discussing the question, whether heretics are to be punished by the civil Magistrate, introduces this very case of Servetus, and defends the justice of his sentence, on the ground of the complicated and enormous heresies which he had propagated, for more than twenty years, with great virulence and obstinacy, against all the means used to reclaim him.*

Here, some may be ready to ask, why all this parade of authorities? and what is to be inferred, when so many distinguished names are called up, in justification of Calvin? Certainly not that persecution could ever be justified, but that religious freedom was not at that time understood, and that the spirit which prompted the persecution of Servetus was the fault, not of one man, or one religious sect, but of the age in which the reformer lived. Every enlightened christian will now heartily lament it; but it argues anything, rather than christian charity, to try those holy men, who lived and suffered in the early twilight of the reformation, before the dawn of religious liberty, by the light which has been steadily increasing, particularly on that subject, for almost three centuries.

Who, among all the accusers of John Calvin, would have earned a better title to the gratitude of posterity, had he been born like that great reformer, in the beginning of the sixteenth century? Verily, "shame and confusion of faces" belong to the men, who pertly arraign the illustrious father of so many of the reformed churches at their partial tribunals, and summarily sentence him to the reprobation of mankind, instead of imitating his virtues, casting the mantle of charity over his faults, and making reasonable allowance for the prejudices of the period in which he lived.† Perhaps, if they had been his cotemporaries at Geneva, they might not have been concerned in the prosecution of Servetus;—

* "They who speak against the punishment inflicted on the profligate Servetus, as unjust and cruel, that they may thereby raise an odium against the most noble magistrates of Geneva, and especially, against that great man of God, Calvin, have never sufficiently weighed the atrocity of his offence." "The affair did not come to this issue but with reluctance, nor until all other means to overcome his obstinacy, and bring him to repentance, had been tried in vain; and he might, if he would, have avoided punishment." "Nothing was done in this business by the magistrates rashly and precipitately, but with mature deliberation on all the circumstances in the fear of God; and not without consulting the most noble rulers of reformed Switzerland, who acknowledged the equity of the sentence, and approved it by their own vote." *Institutio Theologicæ Elencticæ* Vol. iii. p. 373.

† Robertson, in his history of Charles V., lays down the following equitable principle, which well applies to the case before us: IN PASSING JUDGEMENT ON THE CHARACTERS OF MEN, WE OUGHT TO TRY THEM BY THE PRINCIPLES AND MAXIMS OF THEIR OWN AGE, NOT BY THOSE OF ANOTHER."

James Peirce, a distinguished Arian Minister of Exeter (England) in his Letter to Dr. Snape, entitled "The Dissenter's Reasons for not writing in Behalf of Persecution," declares that Calvin, in his treatment of Servetus, "only acted as all other Protestants, as well as Papists, would have done at that time, when the doctrine of toleration was unknown to the world." See Hist. of Dissenters Vol. iii. p. 140.

but, on the other hand, is it at all likely they would have done as much as Calvin did, to defend the doctrines and promote the cause of true religion? Let him that is without sin among his accusers, or that is holier, and more devoted to the service of the Redeemer, cast the first stone at the head of Calvin.

To have said less on this painful subject, would have been injustice to Calvin's memory ; and to say more, would transcend my present limits. Indeed, the apology which I have thought it my duty to offer, in the case of Servetus, will necessarily exclude from this biographical sketch many incidents which would serve to raise the character of the reformer in the estimation of every candid reader.

I cannot, however, conclude, without subjoining a few additional remarks. The hours of sleep with Calvin were few ; his mind never slumbered ; his pursuit of knowledge was ardent and unremitting, and his progress astonishing. His perception was quick, and his memory tenacious. Amidst all his multiplied cares and labors, nothing was forgotten ; and such was the command which he acquired over his thoughts, that in composing the most difficult works, when interrupted for hours by company or conversation, he would resume and pursue the train of his reasoning, without reviewing what he had written.

Personal care, interest and reputation, were secondary objects with this great and good man. Love to the cause of Christ was evidently the ruling passion of his soul. For the promotion of this cause, all his talents and learning were assiduously employed. He felt, he thought, he wrote, he labored for the most distant churches, as well as for that under his immediate care, and also for posterity.

While he delighted to cherish the smoking flax, and strengthen the bruised reed, he was sometimes too indignant, perhaps, against the open and obstinate enemies of religion, who profanely trampled on the Gospel, and endangered the souls of men. Anxious to unite all the friends of truth, he was accommodating on points of minor importance ; but would yield nothing which he considered essential, either in doctrine or practice. Thus he lived and acted, not for himself, but for Christ and the Church ; and in the last trying scene of life, he was sustained by the consolations of that Gospel, which he had so long preached to others. His sun shone bright in its going down, and while death was breaking his hold on earthly things, he reposed with unshaken confidence upon the finished work and promises of the Redeemer ; and departed to his rest in the exercise of that faith, which is the " substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen."

The following account of Calvin's treatment of Servetus is from Sennebier's *Histoire Litteraire de Geneve*, Vol. i. pp. 204—227. The high literary reputation of the author renders it peculiarly deserving of attention.

The tragical history of Servetus happened 1553. It has often been related to blacken Calvin's character, by his bitter enemies, and by those who had not seen the pieces in his justification. It has been confidently asserted, that the Genevan Reformer long harbored an implacable hatred of the unfortunate Spaniard, used every effort to gratify his malice, denounced him to the Magistrates of Vienne, and caused seize him in the morning after his arrival at Geneva. Men easily believe what is so positively asserted, and almost imagine it impossible that the tale can be false. Yet Bolzee, the cotemporary and the mortal enemy of Calvin, who wrote his life only to tear his character in pieces, and Maimburg, so celebrated for partiality and misrepresentation, durst not allege those pretended facts, which modern historians have advanced. Bolzee says, that Servetus's haughtiness, insolence, and dangerous projects, making him hated and dreaded at Lyons, he left it for Charlieu; yet afterwards returned to Lyons, and communicated his ideas to Calvin, who keenly opposed them; and, on Servetus sending him his *Restitutio Christianismi*, broke off all intercourse with him. Calvin however did not betray his secrets, or cause seize him at Vienne; for he wrote to Viretus and Farel, that if Servetus came to Geneva, the consequence would be, the loss of his life. Calvin naturally concluded this from the spirit of the laws and government at Geneva, and from the ideas of all sects at that time. Indeed, he bore with Servetus as long as there was any hope of his recovery; and it was the Spaniard who first introduced personal abuse into their controversy. Bucer, Oecolampadius, Farel, Beza, and even the gentle Melancton, approved the sentence passed against him. As it would be unjust on that account to accuse these celebrated men, it is equally unjust to accuse Calvin of hatred to Servetus.

But *Calvin abused his confidence, and sent to Vienne the letters he had received from him, and the Restitutio Christianismi which he had presented him.*—That accusation is absurd. Could Calvin, whose name was execrated by Papists, expect attention to his complaints, or regard to his letters, from the Magistrates of Vienne? Suppose Calvin as cruel as you please, why was he silent for seven years; why did he not in an earlier period commence his persecution of Servetus; and why did he not send to every place where the heretic resided, the letters he had received from him, and his *Restitutio*? It is evident, from a letter of Calvin, dated February, 1546, that Calvin, convinced of the punishment Servetus deserved, would not encourage him to come to Geneva, but intimated to him what he had to fear, should he venture it. He wished, therefore, by keeping him at a distance from Geneva, that he might escape the punishment with which he threatened him, if he came there. So far was he from contriving to subject him to punishment in another place. Indeed, Calvin's writing to the Magistrates of Vienne, and sending them the *Restitutio*, could answer no purpose. It would have been

ridiculous for him to send them a copy of a book printed in France under their eyes, or to point out what was exceptionable in it, which the reading of it would sufficiently do. Accordingly, the sentence passed at Vienne, gives no insinuation that Calvin had interposed in the process. It is true, that the Magistrates of Vienne, knowing that Servetus had corresponded with Calvin, applied to the council at Geneva for his letters. But it is equally true, that their sentence was founded on the errors in his book, and his own confessions; not on these letters.

But *Calvin, informed of Servetus's escape from the prison of Vienne, caused seize him two or three days after his arrival at Geneva.*—Facts do not quadrate with this charge. Servetus escaped from Vienne before the execution of the sentence which condemned him to be burned, 17th June. If he took fifteen days in his flight, he would have been at Geneva the beginning of July, and yet he was not seized there till 13th August. Think not that he was concealed till then somewhere else. A little prudence would prevent his tarrying where Popery was established, lest the clamors of Vienne should overtake him; and Geneva was the first place where he could expect shelter. Probably, therefore, he was seized, not in two or three days, but near six weeks after his arrival. The accusations against him were, 1. His saying, in his Commentary on Ptolemy, that the Bible vain-gloriously celebrated the fertility of Canaan, though indeed an uncultivated and barren country. 2. His calling one God in three persons a three headed Cerberus. 3. His asserting, that God was every thing, and that every thing was God. He did not deny the charges, but pleaded the necessity of toleration. The council of Vienne demanded that he should be sent back to them; but it being left to his choice, he preferred the chance of a more favorable sentence at Geneva, to the certainty of capital punishment at Vienne.

While we blame the principles of jurisprudence which conducted this process, it should be acknowledged, that the Council at Geneva neglected nothing for discovering the truth; exerted every mean for persuading Servetus to retract; and, when all proved in vain, asked the advice of the Swiss Cantons, who unanimously exhorted them to punish the wicked person, and put him out of a condition of spreading heresy. The intolerance therefore of the age, not the cruelty of Calvin, dictated the sentence of the 27th of October, that Servetus should be burnt alive. Castalio alone had the courage to write a dissertation against the punishment of heretics, which, though he was at Basil, he thought it necessary for his own safety to publish under the feigned name of Bellius. There have been both former and latter instances at Geneva, of similar violent proceedings against heretics. In 1536, all were deprived of the right of citizenship who did not admit the received doctrine. In 1558, Gentilis escaped death only by retracting. Calvin says, in a letter written at that time, that Servetus, if he had not been mad, would have escaped punishment, by renouncing his errors, or even by a more modest behaviour. But Servetus persisted to defend his opinions in blasphemous

mous language: the laws of the times could not be violated: and, therefore, the endeavors of some to satisfy themselves with his banishment, and of Calvin to render his punishment less cruel, had no effect. It is certain, Calvin deplored Servetus's fate; and the disputes in prison were managed with much greater moderation on his side, than on that of the panel. In a period when the principles of toleration were not understood, zeal against opinions subversive both of natural and revealed religion drove men to cruel and unwarrantable extremes. Calvin's situation was peculiarly delicate. Roman Catholics accused him of dangerous theological errors. Their eyes were fixed upon him; and had he remained an indifferent spectator of the process against Servetus, they would have pronounced him a favorer of his opinions. Add to this, had Servetus escaped, his gross and abusive charges against Calvin would have appeared well founded; and Calvin's adversaries would have availed themselves of that advantage for ruining his influence.

DEATH-BED SCENES.

I DESIGN, in this paper, to call the attention of my readers to death-bed scenes; and to point out, as well as I am able, the difference between the feelings of the true believer, and those of the impenitent unbeliever, in the nearest views of eternity. This is the more important, as the subject seems not to have been rightly apprehended, always, even by good people, and representations have sometimes been made respecting it, which were unfair, and of course unconvincing.

The true difference, then, between the death of the Christian, and that of the sinner, is not this, that the Christian always leaves the world in joy and triumph, and the sinner always leaves it in darkness and horror. For, in the first place, the true Christian does not *always* meet his last enemy in this happy and triumphant manner. He may be cut off by some sudden stroke of Providence, without opportunity for reflection;—or he may be deprived of reason at the last, and die in a state of mental derangement;—or the effect of disease may be, if not entirely to take away reason, so to stupify or derange the nervous system, as to cast a mist over the faculties, and involve the soul in gloom and fear;—or God may, for wise and holy purposes, withdraw the light of his countenance at the last, and lead his child through a vale of thick darkness to the openings of celestial day. If we are true Christians, we may know assuredly that God will not utterly leave us or forsake us; but we cannot know under what circumstances he may see best to take us out of the world; nor can we know certainly, that he will not find it necessary to try us, even in our last moments, with distressing doubts, and fears, and darkness.

And as the Christian does not always leave the world in triumph ; so neither does the sinner always depart in horror. There are various ways in which we may account for the composure of a stupid and hardened *sinner*, in the hour of death. He may have persuaded himself that there is nothing beyond the present life—that death is an everlasting sleep ; and under this impression, he may leave the world with as little thought or sensibility almost as a brute. Or, with much effort and many misgivings, he may have succeeded in persuading himself that *all* of every character will be happy immediately after death ; and with this impression settled on his mind, he may be willing to die. Or he may never have been enlightened to see the desperate wickedness of his own heart. He believes others are very wicked, and have much reason to be afraid ; but *he* is so nearly perfect, and God is so merciful, that he is confident he has nothing to fear. And with this impression on his mind, he does not fear even to die. He fears not to go into the presence of that God, of whose character and law he is almost as ignorant as he was the moment when he was born.—Or if the sinner has been awakened and convinced, he may have rested on a false hope. He may have mistaken his religious exercises and character, and while he presumes that he is a child of God, he may be a son of perdition. Still, as the delusion is dear to him, and he is unwilling to abandon it, he may be suffered to retain it even to the last. He may meet death in the vain confidence that he is going to heaven, and scarcely dream to the contrary, till he awakes in eternity.

If persons will blind and deceive themselves, (as all these classes of sinners do,) through the whole period of their probation, God is under *no obligations* to send his Spirit, and awaken them, on a bed of sickness, and near the close of life. To be sure, he often does awaken them under these circumstances, and fills their souls with light and terror—perhaps he *generally* does this ; but he does it not always ; and it is far, very far, from being a sure evidence that a person has died a sincere Christian, that he has died with seeming composure.

But although, as we have seen, the Christian does not always die joyful, nor the sinner always miserable ; still, it ought in fairness to be said, that this is, for the *most part*—far more frequently we believe than otherwise—this is the manner, in which these two classes of persons leave the world. The sincere, devoted Christian, unless deprived of his reason, or cut off by some sudden stroke of Providence, *usually* meets death without dismay. His hopes usually strengthen, and his prospects brighten, and his spiritual consolations increase, the nearer he approaches the boundaries of time. And, on the other hand, although the stupid sinner, or the self-confident hypocrite, may sometimes outbrave the terrors of death, still, it is believed this is not commonly the case.

Voltaire trembled and recanted before he left the world. Thomas Paine trembled and was horribly afraid, when he came to die. And those who have bolstered themselves up in error and delusion—who have deceived themselves, and endeavored to deceive others, have usually *done the same*, at the last. In that honest hour, when the world fades, and illusions vanish, and a dread eternity presents itself in near and certain prospect; they have usually awakened to the horrors of their condition, and entreated that mercy which before they despised.

It should be said, also, in comparing the feelings of these two classes of persons in the near views of death, that when the minds of sinners are not disturbed, nor their hopes shaken; their composure, for the most part, is merely *negative*—the mere *absence* of terror and distress—the mere ability to lie down and die, without knowing or caring what is to become of them. Such was the death of Hume, who continued at his cards almost to the last, and spoke of dying with a degree of levity, which is even more shocking than the cry of distress.—But such is not the support and comfort of the Christian. He has something more than a mere *negative composure*—something better than a mere freedom from concern and terror. His joys are positive, they are rational; they are the result of his faith, and of his animating prospects. ‘He knows in whom he has *believed*, and is sure, that he is able to keep that which he has committed to him against that day.’ He knows that death cannot injure him—that it will be but a momentary pang, through which he is passing on to glory. And instead of shrinking from it, he rather welcomes it—he triumphs over it.

Just call to mind, reader, the dying scene of the lamented Payson, and tell me, if *his* supports were merely negative—the mere absence of terror and distress. “I can find no words,” says he, “to express my *happiness*. I seem to be swimming in a river of pleasure which is carrying me onward to the great fountain. God is literally my all in all. If he is present with me, no event can in the least diminish my happiness; and were all the world at my feet, trying to administer to my comfort, they could not add one drop to the cup.” On another occasion, he says, “The celestial city is now full in my view. Its glories beam upon me—its breezes fan me—its odors are wafted to me—its sounds strike upon my ears—and its spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river of death, and this appears but an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step, whenever God shall give permission.” Was this mere negative support, the mere absence of distress, the mere unconcern of the stupid sinner, who lies down and dies, not knowing or caring what is to become of him? Was it not rather the joy of faith, of hope, of Christian assurance? the exultation of a soul, just launching away from these mortal shores, upon the broad ocean of eternity, with a shout of triumph?

But there is *another point*, in which we may compare the dying experience of the sinner, with that of the real Christian, to which I solicit particular attention. It is frequently the case with sinners, especially with those who have been the abettors of *loose religious principles*, that they abandon their principles in the near views of death, and seek support on a surer foundation. But it is *never* the case with the real Christian who believes and loves the truth as it is in Jesus, and has walked conformably to his profession, that he abandons *his* principles in the near prospect of death, and flees for support and comfort to other and looser views of the gospel. Here, then, is a ground of comparison, on which the friends of religion may safely take their stand ;—a comparison, the result of which must always be glorious to the truth. Nothing, it is well known, is more common, than to see the careless sinner alarmed at the last. As he approaches the utmost limit of time, and looks over into the vast unknown, he involuntarily shrinks back. He is afraid. He dares not trust to his own principles. He suspects more and more the goodness of his hope, till he is compelled at length to abandon it, and seek a better support against the day of trial. Nothing is more common, than for persons, who please themselves with the idea that they are natively good, and need no change of heart in order to go to heaven ; or who believe that God is merciful, and will not be strict to mark iniquity, and therefore they have nothing to fear ; or who presume that, on some ground or other, *all* of every character will be happy immediately after death ; and who, in the belief of these, or similar principles, and in the season of health and prosperity, sail along on the stream of worldly pursuits and pleasures, without compunction, and without restraint, flattering themselves that all will be well ;—nothing, I say, is more common than for such persons to *tremble at the last*. In that honest hour which tries men's souls, their confidence, or as I should rather term it, their *presumption*, forsakes them. Their eyes are opened. The character of God and his holy law, their own characters and prospects, can be concealed from them no longer. They see what they are, and where they are, and what they have done, and what is to be the end of them ; and they tremble, and are greatly afraid. They reject with abhorrence the principles on which they have hitherto leaned ; spurn from them the counsellors who have encouraged them in these principles ; and beg for that mercy which they now feel that they need, but which they had previously despised.—Instances like those here referred to have fallen, probably, under the observation of most of my readers. They have fallen, repeatedly, under my own observation. And were you to consult aged and experienced evangelical ministers generally, they could acquaint you with instances of a similar kind which might surprise you. They could tell you of being called often, and perhaps at the dead hour

of night, to visit, to counsel, and to pray with those, who never visited them in health ; who had affected to despise them ; who had rejected the gospel which they preached, and treated it with slight and scorn.

Here, then, are numerous, well-authenticated *facts* on one side of the comparison ;—are there any, of a like description, to compare with them on the other side ? Was the instance ever known, of a person, who embraced, what are commonly called evangelical principles ; who made an open profession of them ; and who continued, while in health and prosperity, to adorn his profession,—of such an one, in the hour of sickness and in the near views of death, abandoning the precious doctrines of the gospel, refusing the society of his Christian friends, calling around him comforters of another description, and fleeing to another gospel for hope and salvation ? *Was such an instance ever known !* I hazard nothing in asserting, in this public manner, that there never was such an instance. No, *there never was such an instance.* There have been instances—alas too frequent—of persons, who in *health* and *prosperity* have exchanged the true doctrines of the gospel for laxer and more accommodating theories ; but these do not come within the present inquiry. Did you ever know the instance, allow me to repeat the question in the same words, of a person, who embraced what are commonly called evangelical principles, made an open profession of them, and continued while in health to adorn his profession,—of such an one, in the hour of sickness, and in the near views of death, abandoning the precious doctrines of the gospel, refusing the society of his Christian friends, calling around him comforters of another description, and fleeing to another gospel for hope and salvation ? And you will allow me to repeat the confidence which I feel, that such an instance never occurred, since the foundation of the world.—Here, then, we have a point of comparison in regard to death-bed scenes, on which we may safely rest—a comparison in which the superiority of the gospel to all the theories and inventions of men is gloriously evinced. Other systems often fail men at the last—fail them in their greatest extremity ; but the gospel, embraced, professed, and adorned *never fails*. So far from this, it becomes more precious in adversity. It is the rock and refuge, the joy and consolation of the soul, when all earthly pleasures vanish ; when all other helpers and comforters fail.

The remarks which have been made may help to direct the sincere inquirer in the search of *religious truth*.—In these days of alteration and discussion, persons are sometimes puzzled to know what is truth. Amidst the claims of conflicting opinions, and opposing sects, their minds become unsettled, and they hardly know what to believe, or what to do.

To persons in this state, I would say, in the *first* place, Forget not that the inquiry, with which your minds are agitated, is one of the utmost importance. It is one in which you are immediately and eternally interested. It respects, not merely your present happiness, but your happiness in death, and your condition forever.—You will remember also, in the second place, that this important inquiry is one which *may be satisfactorily solved*. You are under no necessity of being fatally deceived. Hard indeed would be your lot, if this were the case. You profess to be searching for the truth, and the truth you may find, if you will search in a proper manner. You may find the truth, by a careful and prayerful examination of the Bible. But as persons sometimes think they can explain away the Bible, you may find the truth by a wise and diligent observation of *facts*. If you will accustom yourselves to visit the dying beds of your fellowmen, and observe their views and feelings in their nearest approaches to the eternal world, you will be likely to gather the truth from them. You will see one class of principles, and one description of character, *almost always* going out, at the last, in darkness. You will find those who have embraced these principles, as a general thing, afraid to die—often greatly distressed and alarmed—and not unfrequently renouncing all their former hopes, acknowledging themselves lost creatures, casting themselves, for the first time, at the feet of Christ, and imploring the mercy of their Saviour. And where the final issue of these principles is not thus painful—where there is composure in death; you will find it little more than a mere negative composure—a mere freedom from terror and distress, without a pretence of feeling much that is positively animating and joyful.

The issue of another system of religion, another class of principles, you will find to be very different. With few exceptions, and these owing chiefly to bodily derangement, these principles afford, not only composure, but consolation and triumph in a dying hour. Those who truly embrace them never distrust them, never renounce them. They cling to them with increasing confidence to the last, and find in them all that light and comfort which they need. Sustained by the principles they have embraced, you may hear these persons singing on the bed of death, “We are now ready to be offered”;—“We know in whom we have believed”;—“We desire to depart and be with Christ”;—“O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory!”

These (with circumstantial modifications) are the *facts* which would present themselves to you, were you to visit extensively and promiscuously the dying beds of your fellow men. And in view of facts such as these, can you doubt, for a moment, what system of religion is to be preferred—what principles constitute the *truth* as it is in Jesus? Or can you hesitate, for a moment, to embrace that religion which has sustained others, and which, you may ex-

pect, will sustain and comfort you, in the dying hour ? Of whatever else you doubt, you know assuredly, that you are going forward—constantly, rapidly going forward—to your closing scene. And you know it will be a trying, decisive scene. It is emphatically the hour which tries men's souls. You feel painfully, at times, that you are unprepared to meet it, and a voice from heaven is sounding in your ears, 'Prepare to meet thy God.' How, then, will you prepare ? What preparation will you make ? Will you embrace a system of religion, because it is fashionable ; because it seems agreeable to you now ; because it imposes but few restraints ; because it permits you to follow the sinful pleasures and amusements of life, while it promises happiness hereafter ;—will you embrace such a religion, as your preparation for death, without once considering whether it has sustained and comforted others in the day of trial, or whether it will be able to sustain and comfort you ? Or will you not rather prepare for death, by embracing the humbling, purifying religion of the Saviour ? that religion which requires you to deny self, take up your cross, come out from the world, to have your conversation in heaven, to continue faithful unto death—and which promises, on these conditions, an unfading, eternal crown of life ? Will you not rather choose and embrace this ?

If you choose to embrace and possess this religion, you must first of all *become acquainted with yourselves*. Learn the melancholy lesson of your own sinfulness, guilt, danger, and ruin, and the absolute need in which you stand of a Deliverer from heaven. And with this impression imprinted on the heart, look up to the provided Saviour. See him, presenting himself before you, almighty, all-sufficient, altogether suited to your circumstances and wants ; and seeing him in this light, cast yourselves, at once, upon his delivering power and mercy. Embrace him, with all the affection and confidence of your souls. Rejoice in him, as your portion and Redeemer, the chiefest among ten thousands, and one altogether lovely. And having embraced the Divine Savior in this way, endeavor to follow him. Endeavor to be like him. Imbibe his Spirit ; copy his example ; believe his word ; *live his religion*,—and thus will this pure and holy religion, with all its supports and consolations, be *yours* ;—yours in time—yours in death—yours in the judgement—yours forever. You will have made choice of that good part which *never* can be taken from you.

REVIEWS.

- I. THE HISTORY OF THE OLD SOUTH CHURCH IN BOSTON, *in four Sermons, delivered May 9th and 16th, 1830, being the First and Second Sabbaths after the completion of a Century from the first Occupancy of the present Meeting-house.* BY BENJAMIN B. WISNER, *Pastor of the Church.* Boston, Crocker & Brewster, 1830. 8vo. pp. 122.
- II. A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE PILGRIMS, *and a Vindication of the Congregational Churches of New-England.* BY JOEL HAWES, *Pastor of the First Church in Hartford.* Hartford: Cooke & Co. and Packard & Butler, 1830. 12mo. pp. 226.

Some persons are unreasonably attached to every thing which is *old*, and will hardly endure that any one should doubt the excellence of that which bears the stamp of antiquity. A greater number, on the contrary, are extravagantly fond of what is *new*, and are ready to believe that every opinion and practice of the present age must be more correct than any which have preceded it. Both classes suffer loss by their exclusive partialities. The friends of antiquity withhold themselves from many advantages which the present generation enjoy, in the way of improvement upon the experience and acquirements of former ages; while the hasty advocates of innovation often mistake the shadow of improvement for the substance, and exchange *old gold* for *new tinsel*. A judicious and discriminating regard to the sentiments and practices, the precepts and examples, of their venerated ancestors, is highly honorable in any people. The conduct of the Rechabites, who dwelt as strangers in their native land, obeying the commands and imitating the example of Jonadab their forefather, was honorably contrasted with that of the Jews among whom they resided, who had departed from the paths of truth and duty marked out for them by their pious progenitors, and by the more sacred and solemn commands and counsels of their fathers' God: and the divine commendation bestowed upon the descendants of Jonadab, and the sentence pronounced on their more highly privileged but less consistent neighbors, are recorded together, for the warning and encouragement of all who have received from a pious ancestry that richest of all inheritances, *true religion*.

Such is our case. The lines have fallen to us in pleasant places: we have a goodly heritage. We dwell in a land, favored beyond any other section of the globe, by the light and privileges of the gospel; and we have risen up to inhabit it as the successors of men, whose attachment to the holy principles and institutions of

Christianity is celebrated throughout the world. We profess to venerate their character ; we pay public honors to their memory ; and many of us, at least, feel ourselves elevated by the title “Sons of the Pilgrims.” But let us beware lest, while we glory in that title, we disgrace and forfeit it :—lest, while we exult in the possession of our invaluable privileges, we forget the grand purpose for which they were transmitted to us, and the means by which alone they can be preserved.

The day draws near which claims our annual tribute of respect and veneration to the memory of the New-England Fathers. And how shall our obligations of filial piety be most becomingly fulfilled ? Not, surely, by feasting and dancing, (as the manner of some is,) around the hallowed graves of the Pilgrims ;—nor by gathering about us, for the gratification of an antiquarian curiosity, the time-worn relics of their humble greatness, and thus soothing our minds to inglorious slumbers in the once storm-rocked cradle of our religious liberties ;—but by a serious review of those principles and practices, by which our pious ancestors were distinguished, and to which we should cherish an attachment proportioned to the value of those blessings and privileges which they have bequeathed to us. Nor need we profit less by such a review, because we live in an age of higher intellectual improvement, or because the concentrated rays of physical and moral science, in this day of boasted illumination, may enable us to detect a few dim spots on the fair escutcheon of their fame. Be it that they “saw not all things ;”—that time-hallowed superstition had rivetted upon them, in the house of their early bondage, some chains, which even the strength of their intellect could not, by a single effort, burst asunder, or the ardor of their piety suddenly dissolve. Still, when we contemplate the nature and magnitude of the holy enterprise in which they were engaged ; and the sacrifices to be made, the hardships to be endured, the perils to be encountered, and the more than Alpine obstacles to be removed or surmounted in its prosecution ; we shall acknowledge that its conception was sublime,—its accomplishment triumphant. The sun of their glory shall not the less enlighten us, because “philosophy’s eagle eye” has betrayed the maculation of its “burning disk.” It shall shine, we trust, with increasing splendor, as their principles are more clearly understood and more faithfully maintained by their descendants ; and shall spread its quickening beams around in wider and warmer radiance, ’till the shades of moral darkness shall flee before it, and the manacles of enthralled and oppressed humanity shall melt beneath it, even in the remotest regions of the earth. Yes, there is reason to hope that the example of rational liberty and enlightened piety, which the character and the institutions of our fathers have presented to the world, will in due time be universally imitated ; and that the noble vine, which God’s right hand hath planted on these once

desolate and dreary shores, shall bless all nations with its shadow and its fruit. But for this it will require laborious and careful culture ; for alas ! its growth and its fruitfulness have been sadly disproportioned. Some of its spreading branches have been comparatively unproductive, and some have "brought forth wild grapes."

To those of our readers, therefore, who have not yet taken up the works, whose titles are placed at the head of this article, we cordially recommend an early and attentive perusal of them. Such a perusal cannot prove uninteresting or unprofitable to those who, in this day of general religious inquiry, are disposed to "stand in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way," that they may "walk therein," and "find rest for their souls." The Rev. Dr. Hawes has paid his worthy and acceptable "tribute to the memory of the Pilgrims," in six Lectures, delivered on Sabbath evenings in March and April last, to the citizens of Hartford, Ct. In the 1st, he has strikingly exhibited the Constitution and Order of the Primitive Churches, in the first two centuries after Christ. In the 2d, he has traced the origin, exhibited the principles, and illustrated the influence of the Congregational Churches of New England. The 3d consists of Deductions from the foregoing lectures, in which he shows that there is a striking resemblance between the Congregational Churches of New England, and the Churches which existed in the primitive ages of Christianity ;—that the principles and polity of the Congregational Churches are happily adapted to all the various circumstances of men, and to the most advanced state of society and of the Church, such as, we have reason to hope, will exist during the millennium ;—that they are wisely adapted to the genius of our civil institutions ;—that they are well calculated to secure the purity of the Churches, both in doctrine and practice ; and that they are powerfully influential in promoting vital godliness. The 4th lecture delineates and defends the character of the Pilgrims ; the 5th marks the causes and extent of declension in our churches ; while the 6th brings to view the means of recovery and defence.

The leading topics of these lectures are strikingly illustrated in the History of the Old South Church by Dr. Wisner ;—a work which proves that he has been no idler in that extensive library of which his venerable predecessor, Prince, was the liberal and judicious founder. The numerous historical and biographical notes appended to the sermons are evidently the fruit of much patient and laborious research, and greatly enhance the interest which every serious reader must feel in the subject of them. The fourth and last discourse concludes with an affecting appeal to the consciences and hearts of the church and congregation who worship on that sacred and memorable spot, "where the Gospel has been preached in its purity to five successive generations ; where the Holy Ghost has so often manifested his special and sanctifying pres-

ence ; where have been seen by Him who looketh into the heart, so many sighs of penitence, so many actings of faith, so many breathings of pure devotion ; where the Most High has had his rest for an hundred and sixty years, and hundreds and thousands of souls may have been fitted to stand and worship before his throne." While reading it, we could not wonder that the preacher should exclaim—and the hearers with silent and deep solemnity unite in the sentiment— ' Oh, how dreadful is this place ! It is none other than the house of God. It is the gate of heaven.'

We have not room for the copious extracts which we should like to make, both from these discourses and from those of Dr. Hawes ; but for the sake of those who may not have access to them, shall briefly touch on a few of the topics of instruction which they present, which seem to us peculiarly seasonable and important.

Among the many honorable traits in the character of the New England fathers, we would commend to special notice the diffusiveness of their religious charity. Theirs was a true *missionary spirit*. They came hither, not merely to find a refuge for themselves and their families from the temporal and spiritual disadvantages to which they were subjected in Europe ; but to make " the wilderness and the solitary place glad for them."—They made all their mighty efforts and costly sacrifices under the influence of " an inward zeal and great hope of propagating the kingdom of Christ to the remote ends of the earth." Accordingly they began, as soon as possible, to instruct the aborigines of their adopted country in the doctrines and duties of true religion. For this purpose, a school was established at Harvard College, and missionaries were sent forth among them, whose truly Apostolic labors were crowned with a success answerable to their diligence and fidelity. " In 1700, there were thirty Indian Churches in New-England, under the pastoral care of the same number of Indian preachers. In some villages, a large proportion of the families were families of prayer. In this noble work, Eliot, and Mayhew, and Bourne, and Cotton took the lead, and were followed by Treab, and Sargeant, and Edwards, and Brainerd. Thousands of poor Indians, gathered into the fold of Christ by the instrumentality of those servants of God, have entered the world of light, and with them are rejoicing in the presence of their common Redeemer and King.

Nor were the native tribes, in the vicinity of the first settlers, prejudiced against the religion of the Gospel, by the cupidity, and treachery, and cruelty of those who professed it. Their lands were fairly purchased of them, and all treaties with them faithfully and honorably regarded. In this respect, alas ! how is the crown fallen from the heads of their descendants. Did the spirit of our venerable ancestors pervade, as it ought, our national councils, it

would not now be a question of legislative discussion, whether the natives in our Southern and Western States shall be removed from the lands which they occupy to other territories arbitrarily assigned them, without regard to their preference or free consent. We blush for our country that such a question has been permitted to claim even an hour's deliberation among us. The aborigines of this land are indeed "minished and brought low." They are comparatively ignorant, and poor, and weak. But they are *men*; we have one Father; one God hath created us; and their rights are as sacred as ours. Their claim to the land which they occupy, is the strongest which can be conceived. God gave it to them. Man has recognized and renewed the gift. It is secured to them by the *nation's faith*;—treaty upon treaty,—signature under signature,—seal after seal. Our deed of warranty is registered in Heaven:—the record of our solemn negotiations and promises is on high. How then *dare* we take it from them? No matter how much we desire it,—or how easy it would be to seize and possess it,—or how highly *we* may estimate what we offer as an equivalent for it. Still it is *their* prerogative to decide freely whether they will retain or relinquish it; and if we violate that prerogative, we do it *at our peril*. Not that the poor Indians can do us very extensive harm. No;—We have men enough almost literally to fulfil the proud threat of Ben-hadad, and carry away the soil of their territory by handfuls. We can bind them in bundles to be burned, and consume them by hecatombs in the flames of their own defenceless villages:—we can drive them across the Rocky mountains:—we can bury them beneath the waves of the Pacific. But there is a God in heaven, who hears the cry of the oppressed, and who, sooner or later, will bring forth judgement unto truth. While the proud planter erects his splendid mansion on the heritage of the helpless Cherokee, or while beneath a loftier dome "the throne of iniquity frameth mischief by a law,"—"the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it; 'Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and stablisheth a city by iniquity! Woe to him that increaseth that which is not his, and to him that ladeth himself with thick clay! Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite *thee*, and awake, that shall vex thee, and those shalt be for booties unto them? Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee; because of men's blood, and for the violence of the land.' But we hope in God, such guilt and such ruin will yet be averted from us. Surely this nation has felt and resisted oppression enough to know that *power* is not *right*; and a *Christian* people should practically acknowledge, that no accession of wealth or of territory can compensate the loss of *His* favor, "in whose hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all." We rejoice that the merits of this great question are now fairly before the public; and we earnestly

call upon every friend of his country and of humanity, to inquire concerning it with candor and diligence, to speak with sincerity and freedom, and to act with promptitude and decision.

While adverting to the enlightened and enlarged philanthropy of our forefathers, it is cheering to see the Church and Society, whose history Dr. Wisner has given us, maintaining the same honorable character through successive ages.

“The early records abound with votes like the following. The specimen I select is from the record of a meeting held a short time before it was finally determined to take down the first meeting-house, and erect this expensive building. ‘Voted, that *twenty pounds* be delivered to Deacon Henschman, for the purchasing of Bibles, to be distributed to the proper objects, as there shall be occasion ; that *ten pounds* be distributed in other books, at the discretion of the Trustees ; that *twenty pounds* be given to Mr. Josiah Cotton, to encourage his settlement at Providence ; that *fifteen pounds* be given to the Rev. Mr. Matthew Short of Easton, for his encouragement in the work of the ministry ; that *fifteen pounds* be given to the Rev. Mr. James Hale, of Ashford, for his encouragement in the work of the ministry ; that *fifteen pounds* be given to the Rev. Mr. Nathaniel Prentice, of Dunstable, for his encouragement in the work of the ministry, to be laid out in books as the Trustees shall judge proper upon discoursing with him.’ And about three months after, at a meeting at which several votes were passed in relation to funds to build the new meeting-house, I find the following, ‘Voted that *fifteen pounds* be given to Joseph Secombe, towards his support at the College.’ And so I might read on to you, in relation to every year, almost down to the revolution. These and similar donations were the avails of collections on each fast and thanksgiving day, to be devoted to ‘pious uses, for the advancement of Christ’s kingdom, and other proper objects of charity.’”

On the above extracts, Dr. W. strikingly remarks,

“Stated and liberal contributions to promote, in different ways, the spread of religion, are not, you perceive, so modern a device as is sometimes supposed. Here was a Bible Society, a Tract Society, a Missionary Society, an Education Society, more than an hundred years ago, all combined in one Association ; and that Association was the Old South church and congregation. And in contemplating this interesting fact, you are, doubtless, presented with one principal reason of the remarkable preservation and almost uninterrupted prosperity of this church. She has from the beginning felt it to be a blessed privilege to water others ; and God has, in faithfulness to his promise, poured out upon her the continual dew of his blessing.”

Had all the churches planted by the pilgrims and their early descendants, and nourished by their alms and prayers, been equally faithful in this respect, the work of domestic missions, and of Bible and Tract distribution, would not have accumulated so mightily upon the hands of the present generation. Our country would, in a religious view, have presented a very different aspect.

Yet let us not sit down in discouragement, but “arise and build.” Let us “redeem the time because the days are evil.” We hold all our possessions by a sacred tenure :—they are the unalienable property of “*Christ and the Church*,” and cannot, without a kind of sacrilege, be prostituted to the purpose of mere private interest, or temporal gratification and aggrandisement. To preserve and promote religion at home and abroad, is our proper business. For this, God gave the country to our ancestors, and they have bequeathed it to us. With this land, we inherit the du-

ty and the privilege of serving the Redeemer with all our strength and with all our substance ; nor, if we have the spirit of our fathers,—the spirit of the Gospel,—shall we shrink from any labors or any sacrifices, which may be hopefully instrumental in renewing that general prevalence of evangelical order and purity by which New England was once so gloriously distinguished.

Here opens upon our view a wide field of Christian research and Christian exertion. American colonists of modern days have most sorrowfully and alarmingly departed from the good way of our pilgrim fathers, in regard to the institutions and duties of religion. While the tide of our population has overflowed the ancient landmarks and rolled onward to the west with unexampled and inconceivable rapidity, it has not borne upon its swelling bosom the spiritual beauties and blessings of the father-land.

Within the last eighty years, the relative proportion of ministers to the population has diminished more than one half, even within the bounds of New England ; and when we look to the southern and western divisions of the Union, the disproportion is still more deplorable. Were the ministers of the Gospel equally distributed among the people of the United States, there would be but one to about 1900 souls ! But there is no such equal distribution. While New England and the Atlantic States generally have far below an adequate supply, the wide regions of the West, already peopled with about four millions of immortal beings, and nearly doubling their number every ten years, are comparatively destitute of the means of grace.

What shall we say to these things ? Shall we survey this vast moral desert,—this continually widening and darkening region of the shadow of death within our own borders,—in silence and listless inactivity ? Do we not believe that righteousness exalteth a nation, and that sin is the reproach and the ruin of any people ? On the presumption, then, that *New England is secure* in the enjoyment of her religion and liberties, and the countless and inestimable blessings which they confer, are we willing to give up the largest and the fairest section of our land,—a region already sustaining four millions of inhabitants, and destined, at no distant period, to sustain forty millions,—to the undisputed sovereignty of the Prince of Darkness ? Christian philanthropy forbids it !

But *we are not secure*. Those populous and growing States are inseparable branches of our national confederacy ; and if we do not feel, as Christians, that *they belong to us*, they will ere long make us know that, as American citizens, and subjects of a general government, *we belong to them*. They will soon be the *majority* in the Union. They will appoint our rulers, and make our laws, and form our character, and direct our course, and control our destiny, as a nation. For our own sake, therefore, if all nobler motives should be suppressed, we must labor, and spend,

and be spent, to bring them under the benign and powerful influence of the Gospel ; since that influence alone will qualify them to enjoy and to preserve the privileges of a free and independent people. The resources of the elder States, notwithstanding their degeneracy, are yet sufficient to enlighten and save the land ; but those resources must be put in requisition without delay, or the opportunity for their successful application will pass away, and that *forever*. The western section of our Union totters on a fearful precipice. Atheism, Infidelity, and Papacy are uniting their strength, with all the corrupt propensities and turbulent passions of our fallen nature, to hasten its overthrow. If it falls, it

—————“falls like Lucifer,
Never to hope again.”—————

Nor will it fall *alone* :—it will hang like a mill-stone about the fair neck of New England, and she must go down with it to the unfathomable depths of national degradation and wretchedness.

If we be charged with extravagance in our estimate of the influence which religion or irreligion must exert upon the future destinies of our country, we can appeal to high authority for its correctness. Says Gen. Washington, “ Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be obtained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of a peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that *national morality* can prevail, in exclusion of *religious principle*.” The sentiments of President Quincy on the same subject, as eloquently expressed in his late address to the citizens of Boston, were given on the closing page of our last number. One sentence only we beg leave here to repeat :—a sentence worthy to be uttered daily, and to be inscribed, in indelible characters, “ in the top of high places,—by the way in the places of the paths,—at the gates,—at the entry of the city,—at the coming in at the doors.”

“ The great comprehensive truths, written in letters of living light on every page of our history,—the language addressed by every past age of New England to all future ages is this ;—*Human happiness has no perfect security but freedom ;—freedom none but virtue ;—virtue none but knowledge ; and neither freedom, nor virtue, nor knowledge has any vigor, or immortal hope, except in the principles of the Christian faith, and in the sanctions of the Christian religion.*”

Such being the acknowledged importance of true religion to the welfare of the community, it becomes an interesting question, *What form of ecclesiastical polity is best adapted to the genius of our civil institutions?* To this, Dr. Hawes answers—*Congregationalism*;—and maintains his position by very plain and conclusive reasoning.

“Such are the organization and order of our churches, that they tend, directly and powerfully, to strengthen and perpetuate our civil institutions. Every Congregational Church is not only a school of divine knowledge and piety, but also of civil and religious liberty. There is cherished the spirit, and there are taught the principles, which lie at the foundation of a free government. It is impossible that persons, who are accustomed, in the church, to feel and act as freemen, should be the friends of arbitrary power. Equally impossible is it that such persons, I mean those who are actuated by the true spirit and principles of Congregationalism, should ever wish for a union between church and state. They know full well that the only tendency of such a union is to destroy both civil and religious liberty, and to produce, either an ecclesiastical or political despotism, both of which are equally to be dreaded. And though the remark may seem needless, in this place, I will just drop it in passing, that notwithstanding all the clamor that is raised by infidels and others against the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, as wishing to bring about a union between church and state, there is no denomination in the land that more sincerely deprecates such a union; and none would have to forfeit greater privileges, or make greater sacrifices, if it should finally be effected.”

If then any be disposed to ask, ‘Why was such a union permitted by the New England fathers?’—we would refer them, for a lucid and satisfactory reply, to the second note appended to Dr. Wisner’s sermons. On considering the facts there stated, every candid mind must acknowledge, that it was the fault of *the age*, and not of their *principles*. Circumstanced as they were, the wonder is that they did so well in this respect; and that the close alliance, which almost unavoidably subsisted between the civil rulers and religious teachers of the people, wrought no greater mischief. And while we regret and correct the errors incident to their novel and difficult experiment, let us beware lest we oppose or relinquish the principles which, though somewhat imperfectly developed, were the grand source of all that is truly valuable in our present political and religious institutions. Our fathers regarded piety as the prime qualification for all places of public trust, and services of public importance. They did not consider religion as designed to regulate only the weaker or inferior classes of the community, and satisfy themselves with mere politicians for their rulers. They carefully “looked out just men, fearing God and hating covetousness;” and realized the truth of the scriptural aphorism, “When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice.” To preserve this ground of rejoicing, which they feared might be gradually removed by the influx of unprincipled settlers, they established a *religious test*, making church membership a condition of the right of suffrage, and of eligibility to civil office.—Here, undoubtedly, they erred. Under such a constitution, ambition, or even the love of liberty, becomes a temptation to hypocrisy. The *church is cor-*

rupted ; for many are brought, by sinister motives, into the fold of Christ, who know not the voice of the Shepherd, nor walk in the footsteps of the flock :—and the *state is enfeebled* ; because numbers must be withheld from public service, by that very fear of duplicity which would best ensure fidelity and success in its performance. But, because our predecessors erred on *one* extreme, is there no danger on the other ? Can we find no medium ? Has religion *nothing* to do with civil government ; and are we never to bring piety into the account, when estimating the comparative claims of those who are presented as candidates for public confidence ? Then conscientious Christians *have virtually lost their right of suffrage*. They believe that the fear of God is the beginning of all true wisdom,—the firmest basis of elevated moral character, and the surest pledge of fidelity and usefulness in any and every department of social life. Not that every good man is fit for a ruler,—or that piety will supply the place of intelligence and political information :—but that it imparts *additional value* to all other qualifications, and gives the finishing stroke to a political character otherwise complete. *Other things being equal*, therefore, all who possess the spirit of the Pilgrims, must prefer those candidates for places of power and trust, who appear to be under the influence of *true and vital religion* ;—who “ do justly, love mercy, and *walk humbly with God*.” Far be it from us to disfranchise any man, or lay him under any legal disabilities, for his theological name, or his sectarian peculiarities ;—for his misbelief, or his unbelief ;—provided, only, and always, that he have at least *natural* religion enough to feel the obligation of an oath. But when we have conceded thus much, we ought not to be charged with bigotry or fanaticism, if we claim the right of using our influence, as far as it goes, in favor of those rulers, whose political integrity is strengthened by religious principle ;—whose path of public duty is illumined by “ the day-star from on high.”

But here it may be said, ‘ Religion is easily counterfeited, and if you regard it in any sense as a qualification for office, you hold out a lure to the unprincipled, by offering a premium for hypocrisy.’—And in reply we would beg leave to ask, whether *patriotism* cannot be counterfeited as well as religion ; and whether it would not be best to dispense with that also as a qualification for office, lest we should multiply political hypocrites ? In fact, if the argument be allowed any weight, it goes to prove that all reference to personal character in candidates for public stations must be laid aside. Thus it would prove far too much :—it therefore falls to the ground.

And now we would turn to the friends of truth and piety, and ask, whether by neglecting to weigh the claims of candidates for political eminence in the balance of the sanctuary, they do not in fact offer a *premium for irreligion* ? The world will love its own.

Sound faith and ardent piety form no passport to general favor, in this day of vaunted liberality. If, then, the friends of religion attempt to take neutral ground in relation to this subject, the other portion of society will not meet them there. The God of this world will relinquish no advantage which is given him ; but unless proper measures are taken to prevent it, there is reason to fear that decided piety will, ere long, not only cease to be a recommendation to public favor, but will acquire all the force of a civil disability. Thus the temptations to practical infidelity, which already beset the path of the ardent and aspiring, will be strengthened and multiplied, and to them the Saviour's pointed and alarming interrogatory will apply with all its original emphasis,—“ How can ye believe, who receive honor one from another, and seek not the honor which cometh from God only ?”

Let it be remembered, it is not the interest of a sect or a party for which we now plead, but the interest of the great community to which we belong. Good people of all sects have too long and too deeply slumbered over this momentous subject. They have been too easily satisfied with the declaration, that, as our government claims no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the church should exert no influence in its organization. ‘Our rulers’ it is said, ‘do not meddle with religion in their official capacity :—let not religion, therefore, in any way be brought into the question of their election.’ This argument is plausible ; and the conclusion would be more correct if the premises were true. But the fact is lamentably otherwise. Our rulers, in the legislative, and executive, and judicial departments, *do* meddle with religion in most serious earnest ; and the church of Christ throughout the land has felt their unhallowed touch in every nerve. Witness the mail laws, by which the holy Sabbath, the day so dear to our fathers, is openly desecrated ; and the congressional discussions and decisions respecting it, in which, as by a new declaration of independence, our allegiance to the King Eternal, Immortal and Invisible is virtually thrown off, and our obligation of obedience to his high and holy enactments reduced to a mere question of political expediency ! Witness, too, the exertion of judicial authority to take from our churches their prescriptive and chartered rights,—confiscate their property, and destroy their very being.—But we must stop. We are not indeed without apprehension that our readers will think we have already detained them too long from the more interesting pages which have given occasion for these remarks, and which it was our principal object to place before them. With one more extract, therefore, from Dr. Hawes, which summarily and distinctly expresses our views on the topic just noticed, we take our leave.

“ In all attempts to build up the cause of Christ, scrupulously avoid a worldly, selfish policy. The religion of Christ frowns on such a policy, and demands to be promoted only by plain, open, honest conduct, proceeding from motives that will bear to be inspected in the face of day.”

"Carefully guard also against connecting, in any manner, the interests of the church with the affairs of state, or the politics of the day. *Let there be no political combinations for religious purposes, nor religious combinations for political purposes.* Experience proves that the tendency of all such combinations is to corrupt religion and destroy the energies of the church. *My kingdom, says our Lord, is not of this world ;—Not of this world in its spirit ; not of this world in its aims ; not of this world in the means of advancing its prosperity, and extending its influence on earth.* Every day, I am more and more convinced, that the great point to be aimed at in this country is to withdraw the church, as far as possible, from the collisions of politics, and the strife of party spirit. In these angry times, religion has nothing to hope from civil government ; I wish I could add, it has nothing to fear from it. The only true and safe policy is to let the church stand on its own immutable foundation—the truth and promise of God ; and to adopt only such means in building it up as are sanctioned in his word."

"Not that Christians are to take *no part* in the political concerns of their country. They are freemen ; they possess the rights and lie under the responsibilities of freemen, and can by no means be excused from bearing a part in sustaining the interests and promoting the welfare of the community of which they are members. Especially does the right of suffrage impose on them a very sacred duty ; and in the exercise of that right, they are solemnly bound to commit themselves to the dictation of no party, but with an enlightened conscience, and in the fear of God, always to withhold their support from *bad men* of every name, and to give their votes in favor of such as are best qualified for the duties of office, to whatever denomination or party they belong. I will just add in this connection, that so *totally depraved* are the politics of the day, that I see not how a Christian can enter fully into the spirit of them, or commit himself to any party, to go all lengths with them, without doing violence to his conscience, and greatly injuring his christian character and influence. Certain I am, that if the churches of our country are to prosper, or if the members in communion with them are to grow in faith, and love, and usefulness, they must be preserved from the *mania* of party zeal, and stand aloof from the conflicts of ambition, and the din of political controversy. Their sphere of influence is more retired and silent. It is in the sanctuary, in the family, in the every-day intercourse of life, in diffusing around them the spirit of holiness, and exemplifying in conduct the pure and blessed principles of the gospel."

A REPLY TO A LETTER IN THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, ADDRESSED TO THE REV. PARSONS COOKE, Boston : Peirce & Williams, 1829. pp. 38. Also, *the more Recent Publications of Mr. Cooke*, in the Boston Daily Advertiser, and Boston Courier.

(Continued from p. 35.)

In our number for January, we commenced a Review of the publications of Mr. Cooke, in reply to the Christian Examiner, and to certain articles in the Daily Advertiser. It was not our intention, at that time, to defer concluding our remarks for so long a period, but circumstances beyond our control have rendered the delay unavoidable.

The publications of Mr. Cooke commenced with a Sermon, addressed to his people on the day of the annual Fast, April 3, 1828, designed to exhibit the *political* influence of Unitarianism in Massachusetts. This was the *original subject*, which gave occasion to the Letter in the Christian Examiner, attributed to the late

Chief Justice Parker. But as the controversy proceeded, another subject incidentally came up, of deeper interest to many than the first, viz. "the management of the pecuniary concerns of Harvard University during the Presidency of Dr. Kirkland." Facts were elicited in regard to this subject, which imperiously call for an investigation. We have no wish to accuse or needlessly to injure any person. But this community have a right to *know* how the money they have lavished on Harvard University has been expended; and before the subject is permitted to rest, they *will* know—at least more than they do at present. Why should they not? Why should the friends of the late President and Treasurer be unwilling that all the facts in the case should come to light? If these gentlemen managed with prudence and economy, and their accounts were left in a proper state, an investigation is due to them. And let the facts be what they may, the truth is to be preferred to perpetual suspicion. Who would wish, either for himself or his friends, to live and die the object of such suspicion? The *truth* of the case is what this community wish, and this they feel that they have a right to demand. The subject ought to have been undertaken in the Board of Overseers, a year ago. We hope our Honorable Senators and Counsellors will come to the meeting of the Board the present winter, charged by their constituents not to let the subject pass without a full investigation. But we need not dwell longer on this topic here, as it was fully considered in our number for January, to which the reader is referred.

We turn now to the original subject of discussion in the publications of Mr. Cooke—the *political influence of Unitarianism in Massachusetts*.—It was decided, almost twenty years ago, in the leading Periodical of the then 'liberal party,' that "the best *policy* for a layman wishing the votes of the people to adopt, in regard to his religious profession," is, not to be a Calvinist—"that catholic [liberal] Christians are *more likely* than sectarists to obtain such *political situations as will give them influence and power*."* And from that time to the present—perhaps even previous to that time—this decision has been in a course of perpetual verification.

"It was remarked, several years since, in the public papers, "Any person, to attain to any of the honors of this State, must be a thorough Federalist and Unitarian. If they have the blotch of democracy or Calvinism about them, they must bid adieu to public honors, or to Massachusetts. The Catholics are not more exclusive in Spain, than are Mr. Otis and his associates in Boston." In the political changes which have since occurred, the exclusion of democracy has ceased; but the exclusion of Orthodoxy still remains. It is as true now, as it ever was, that if persons, "have the blotch of Calvinism about them, they must bid adieu to public honors or to Massachusetts." The Trinitarian denominations in the State together comprise more than three fourths of the people. And more than nine tenths of the political influence is in the hands of the Unitarians."

* General Repository, Vol. iv. p. 374.

Executive appointments (whether designedly or not the public must judge) have been so made, in a vast majority of cases, as to favor Unitarians. And this has occurred not only in the Eastern part of the State, where Unitarians are numerous, but in the middle and Western parts, where it would seem they must literally be singled out, in order to be made the objects of favor. It is wonderful, also, to see how our popular elections are managed to bring about the same result. In towns, where a majority of the voters are anti-evangelical, to see a man of orthodox principles, however capable and honest, advanced to any considerable post of honor or profit, is a rare event. It is not expected; and if it were, it almost never occurs. But even this is not so strange, as the course of things in towns of a different character.

"I could point you to towns where not one in twenty of the citizens belong to the liberal class, but which for many years in succession, have been represented in the legislature by men of this class. Yes, while the legislature has for many years been pursuing measures of the most exclusive sectarianism, and the fact has been seen and felt by many, strange to tell, evangelical men of every name have tamely lent the influence of their vote to sustain the men and the measures of which they complain."

A similar statement was made in the Legislature, during the last winter, by representatives from different parts of the State.

"For my own part," said Mr. Freeman of New Bedford, who styled himself a *Nothingarian* as to religious profession, "I believe the Orthodox rather neglectful of secular things, so intent are they in attending to the things which belong not to this world. How else is it that *they have so small a share of the honors and emoluments of office—that the Governor, the Council, the Judges, and so large a portion of the Senators and Representatives are against them. I could point out many gentlemen in this house who represent Orthodox communities, although opposed to them in religious sentiments.*"

"In the County of Berkshire," said Mr. Perkins, of Becket, "where I suppose there is not one Society that the gentleman would call liberal, and where the great body of the people may be termed Orthodox, *there is no exclusion on account of religious sentiment, as the history of their elections shows. In the town I have the honor to represent, nearly all are of the denomination which is so terrific to the gentleman; perhaps I (their representative) am in a single minority.*"

From these testimonies it is evident that there have been no undue attempts among the Orthodox, in those parts of the state where they constitute an overwhelming majority, to elevate those of their sect to the possession of office. So far from this, they have been negligent, perhaps to a fault, in regard to the whole subject, and suffered the honors within their gift to pass easily into other hands. We would that there had been as little appearance of exclusion on the other side. *Political exclusion*, not destitution of office, is that, let it be remembered, of which we complain. We know it is said often before the public, that the religious sentiments of candidates for office should never come into the question of their election or appointment. But have they not come into the question? Has it never been whispered by "the liberals"

among us, when persons have been proposed for office, 'Are they with us in their theological views? *Are they liberal?*'—We have some astounding facts in our possession on this subject, which we hope never to be obliged to publish. We are unwilling the religious community should be agitated on a subject of this nature. If partiality has been shown and wrong done, we prefer it should be rectified in some other way.

There are reasons, we admit, why, in the present state of the world, decidedly religious men are not selected so commonly as others to be the objects of political preferment, without imputing sectarian designs to any person or party interested; and we are disposed to give to these reasons their full weight and influence. We are willing to put the best construction on existing appearances in our power.

In the first place, religious men have no strong *desire* for political preferment. They are engaged in other things, which they think of vastly greater importance; in which they feel a deeper interest; and from which they are not willing to be separated, to be plunged into the bustle and dissipation of political life.—Under the influence of feelings such as these, it may not have been a leading object in the studies of such men to qualify themselves for the management of political affairs. Their reading, their reflections, their associations, may have been chiefly of a different character. Their thoughts have been turned to nobler objects than those which pertain almost exclusively to the present world.—Besides, the decidedly religious man can never be popular, except with his religious friends, and these feel as little interest in seeing him promoted in political life, as he does in grasping for such promotion. How can a person of this character expect to be popular with men of loose principles and irregular habits? His example will be a continual reproof to them. His strictness and faithfulness will offend them. They will think him morose, exclusive, enthusiastical, bigoted, and when they have honors to bestow, will be sure that they do not light on him. They will prefer the man of easy principles, of pliant conscience, who is less afraid to sin against God, and less ready to reprove and admonish those who do sin. Were an angel of light to become incarnate, and take up his residence in our land, with all his intelligence and integrity, it is not likely he would ever be promoted to civil honors. He would not seek such honors for himself; those who best loved him would not seek them for him; and the proud, the worldly, the loose thinkers and loose livers, comprising (we regret to say) no inconsiderable portion of our population, would resolve that he should receive no favor or support from them.

In the present state of our political affairs, it is not easy for the religious part of this community to determine what they ought to do. That the denominations, usually classed under the appellation

of Orthodox, might combine their forces, draw in the aid of their friends, and take possession of the political high places of Massachusetts, will not probably be questioned. But we are not willing, unless literally driven to it, to resort to measures such as these. We have no heart for them, and no ambition to be gratified in this way. We are doing—in our own estimation—a great work, and are unwilling to come down from it, to engage in a contest for political power. We might even prefer that the present course of things should continue, and consent to bear the evils attending it, rather than call off our religious friends from their devotional meetings, their revival scenes, their charitable associations and efforts, and plunge them into the vortex of political strife. To those who love preferment and office, and have so managed as to get upon the saddle, we are perfectly ready to say, on our own behalf, and (so far as we know the sentiments of our brethren) on theirs also, ‘Treat us fairly, and you may ride in welcome. Treat us impartially and honorably, and we will not trouble you.’

This form of expression will be understood to imply (what is true) that we do not think we have been treated, in all respects, fairly, in years past.—We do not think it fair to have our exclusion from office, or our retirement from it, whichever it may be called, urged, for sectarian purposes, as an argument against us. Because we have not eagerly *sought* office for ourselves or our friends, we do not quite like to hear it insinuated that we are an inferior class of beings, and have no men among us capable of holding the high offices of the state. Nor do we choose to have our young men, our educated men, decoyed from us, under the impression that if they are ever to make a figure in the world, they must, of course, become Unitarians.

We do not think it right to be charged, as we are in the Letter to Mr. Cooke, attributed to the late Chief Justice Parker, with endeavoring to “overthrow the institutions by which the state is upheld, in order to erect on their ruins a power, which by us may be deemed a blessing, though in all ages it has been found a curse.”* When our chief political sin, if we are guilty of any, has been negligence, want of interest, owing to our being engrossed with other things, we think it abusive that those who enjoy power through our indifference to it should look down upon us, and lightly charge us with palpable treason—charge us, without the slightest attempt at proof, with wishing to ‘overthrow the institutions of the state, in order to erect on their ruins an odious Ecclesiastical power.’

We do not think it fair that acts of incorporation are denied us, or if not flatly denied, are with great difficulty and embarrassment obtained, on the simple ground, so far as we can see, of our religious opinions and character. Mr. Cooke has adverted to several of these cases.

* Christian Examiner, Vol. v. p. 279.

"Not long after the institution of the Theological Seminary at Andover, its growing popularity and importance made it necessary that the powers of the trustees should be enlarged. But it was not till after long and painful exertion, that their reasonable wishes in this respect could be granted. And when, at length, they were granted—when the trustees were empowered "to receive and hold personal estate, the annual income of which should not exceed twenty thousand dollars;" the grant must be accompanied with the provision, "that no student shall be deprived of any privileges of said institution, or be subjected to the forfeiture of any aid, or be denied the usual testimonial on closing his studies, on the ground that his interpretations of the Scriptures differ from those which are contained in the articles of faith adopted by said institution."

"Now, whatever the ruling aristocracy may think of grants such as this, I cannot but regard them in the light of oppressive bargains. The legislature stoops to sell its paper, to buy chances for the spread of Unitarianism; or, at least, it consents to barter its paper, to obtain the power of depressing Orthodoxy. I am happy to state, that one prominent member of the legislature, who was forward and active in this Andover business, has since repented, and has declared to gentlemen connected with the institution, that he cannot reflect upon the part which he then took in opposing them, with the least pleasure."

Mr. Cooke refers, also, to the difficulty of obtaining an act of incorporation for Amherst College, and to the very singular conditions under which the charter was at length obtained.

"The legislature, in the first place, assumes, the right of striking such names as it pleases from the Board selected by the petitioners, and filling their places with others. Next, it must have the right of filling the first five vacancies in the Board which occur. And finally, it must have the right of appointing the successors of these five members, to the end of time."

This right of filling vacancies was reserved, as events have pretty clearly shown, with the design of thrusting as many Unitarians as possible into the Board.

Mr. Cooke also speaks, in few words, of the Blandford case. We shall take the liberty to bring this case more fully before our readers; because, in the first place, a remembrance of it ought to be preserved; and because it is a pretty fair exemplification of the evils under which the Orthodox of Massachusetts have been called to suffer.

In the year 1824, the first religious society in Blandford petitioned the legislature to incorporate certain individuals, as trustees of their ministerial funds. In the bill which they prepared to be presented to the legislature, in order that it might become a law, they distinctly stated what kind of minister they wished the funds to be appropriated to support. The wishes of the society and of the donors of the fund, all of whom were then living, perfectly harmonized on this point. When the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Parishes, one or two members of that Committee objected to reporting favorably, on account of the phraseology declaring the *character and qualifications* of the ministers to be supported. For reasons which it is not material to state, this bill never came under the consideration of the legislature.

In the spring session of 1827, the Society renewed their petition for incorporation; but the subject was deferred to the winter ses-

sion of 1828. In the bill then presented, it was declared that the proceeds of the fund "shall be paid towards the support of a learned, pious, Trinitarian, Congregational minister, settled by the Society, with the concurrence of the first Congregational church in Blandford, according to the terms on which such fund has been given; and to no other purpose whatever." We understand that the person who prepared the bill, extracted the phraseology just quoted, *mutatis mutandis*, from the Act incorporating the Trustees of the ministerial fund in the first parish in Boxford, passed in 1825. It was not anticipated that any objection could be made to a precedent which the legislature itself had so recently established; but no sooner was the bill presented (such is the progress of *liberal* principles) than opposition began to discover itself with reference to the clause which recognized the existence and the immemorial rights and usages of the church. The gentleman to whom the business was entrusted by the society, perceiving that the retention of that clause would probably defeat the whole object, consented to have it stricken out, leaving the bill to read as follows: The proceeds of the fund "shall be paid toward the support of a learned, pious, Trinitarian, Congregational minister, settled over the said society."

The opposers of the bill, having gained this victory, proceeded to make further encroachments. The obnoxious epithet, "Trinitarian," was the next object of attack. As this was the only remaining word which made the bill in any degree distinctive and discriminating, as to the sentiments of the ministers to be supported, it was thought very desirable that it should be retained. Evidence was therefore presented to show, that all the donations to the fund were made with the *express intention* that they should be devoted to the support and maintenance of ministers of those religious sentiments usually denominated Calvinistic, evangelical, Orthodox. But when party feelings are to be gratified, the wishes of donors must go for nothing. The word "Trinitarian," was therefore expunged. And as though all this was not sufficient, a section was appended, providing that "the legislature shall have power, to alter, amend, or repeal this act at pleasure."

One would have thought that "*liberality*" had now been sufficiently illustrated, and that the bill, in its present garbled, mutilated state, might have been suffered to pass into a law. In the Senate, it did pass to be engrossed. But in the House, there were not a few who still suspected that Orthodox ingenuity had contrived to weave something into the bill, though they could not point it out, which might operate to favor the venerable doctrines of the New England churches. They concluded, therefore, that the safest way would be to crush it; and its friends, believing that if it should pass, as it then was, it would not be such a law as the Society in Blandford could conscientiously act under, united with its enemies in giving it an indefinite postponement.

Such is a history of this extraordinary affair. For a verification of the facts stated, the reader is referred to the files of the House of Representatives. Nothing exactly similar had ever before been exhibited in the legislature of Massachusetts, though the same spirit has since discovered itself in repeated instances. The grand objection to incorporating a society for the support of a Trinitarian minister was, that it would go to perpetuate a particular system of doctrine.* And what if it would? Had not the good people in Blandford a right to choose their own religion? and a right to give their money to support the religion of their choice? and a right to legal security and protection in the appropriation of this money? In how many hundreds of instances have our legislature granted incorporations which went to perpetuate a particular system of doctrine? And are they not every year doing the same? How can they incorporate an Episcopal Society, or a Presbyterian Society, or a Methodist Society, independent of the creeds of these several denominations? Or how can they incorporate a Society for the support of a Unitarian Minister (for the word Unitarian is now as distinctive as Trinitarian) which shall not go to perpetuate the Unitarian doctrine? And the same may be said of a Baptist Society, or a Universalist Society, or a Swedenborgian Society, or of almost any other religious society whatever. All these different denominations have their peculiarities of doctrine, of which the names by which they choose to be called are descriptive and distinctive; and an act of incorporation given to either of them must, in a fair understanding of the terms, go to perpetuate some particular system. What then shall our legislature do? Shall they stop incorporating religious societies? Have they stopped? Or have they not, for some of the last years, repeatedly proclaimed, on the pages of their journals, their *special* hatred of the religion of their fathers, and their determination to put it down, by *partial*, arbitrary legal enactments? We are as sorry to be obliged to say these things, as any of our readers can be to hear them. But are they not the plain truth, and truth which it is important should be told,—that some of our “liberal” legislators may see how their acts appear to others—how the world is likely to judge of them—and may return to that fair, impartial course of procedure, which alone can secure them respect and confidence?

The discussions, during the last winter session, on the application of the American Temperance Society for incorporation, are of too recent a date to require a particular description. Suffice it to say that this noble society, the story of whose labors and successes in the cause of virtue and humanity has crossed the Atlantic, and is told with admiration in the centre of Europe—a Society which any Christian legislature might be proud to receive under its pro-

* See Christian Register for March 22, 1828, in which will be found a brief report of the discussions in the Legislature, and a high recommendation of their proceedings.

tection, made application, almost a year ago, to the legislature of Massachusetts for incorporation. The act of incorporation passed the Senate; but it was discovered by certain *ultra liberals* in the House, that most of the existing members of the society were Orthodox—that its Constitution made the members elective—and, consequently, that in all probability it would continue to be an Orthodox society. Noble, therefore, as was its object, and great as was the good which confessedly it had accomplished, it could not be tolerated for a moment. A violent opposition was excited against it; its supporters were accused of flagitious designs and corrupt practices; Unitarians and Universalists united their forces, and signalized themselves in their efforts to crush it; nor was the act of incorporation suffered to pass without a provision, according to which the doors of the society were to be opened, so that all persons might become members, by paying a specified sum of money.—Now much as we reprobate the spirit by which this provision was annexed, still, if it renders the society more agreeable to any considerable part of our population, we are heartily glad that the existing members have accepted it. We are persuaded it can never injure them, and probably will make but little difference as to the character of those who constitute the Society. The enemies of Orthodoxy, in general, are as strongly opposed to *total abstinence* from spirituous liquors, as they are to the doctrine of “*total depravity*,”* and they cannot be expected to pay large sums of money for the advancement of a cause, to which they are so sincerely averse.

Another evil of which we complain, and in regard to which, nothing shall stop our complaints but redress—or death, is the manner in which our churches are regarded and treated. Strange, that the *original* institution in the settlement of this country—that, to establish and promote which our fathers came here—the *churches* of our Lord Jesus Christ—should be denied the powers, privileges, and rights pertaining to all voluntary associations, and without which existence is not worth the name—the right to choose their own officers, to hold and control their own property, and to manage, independently, their own concerns! Strange, that churches which the pilgrims planted, BEFORE THERE WAS A PARISH IN THIS LAND, should now be represented as incapable of existence separate from a parish! that they should be driven from their places of worship, and plundered of their property—should suffer not only exile, but confiscation of goods, and all this under cover of law! We never can be silent on a subject like this. There is palpable wrong, injustice, *cruelty* in it. This course of things might have been entered on unwittingly at first; we wish to think

* One of the opposers of the bill for incorporating the Society said, in debate in the legislature, “I have no faith in *totalities*: either *total depravity*, or *total abstinence*.”

as charitably of its abettors as we can ; but to persist in it now, after all the light which has been shed upon it—is little better than sacrilege.

We shall mention but another subject of complaint, which is, that the Ancient University of this Commonwealth, instituted for the benefit of the whole state, and endowed and supported by the state, has been monopolized by a single sect, and is held and controlled by them, to a great extent, for sectarian purposes.—Can any part of this statement be denied ? Was not Harvard University instituted for the benefit of the whole state ? Was it not originally endowed, and has it not been in great measure supported by the state ? Has it not (by what means we stop not here to show) fallen entirely, exclusively, into the hands of a single sect ? If any doubt this, let them look over its catalogue of officers, recently published, and judge for themselves. Is it not held by this sect with iron grasp ; and controlled by them, to a great extent, for sectarian purposes ? If not, what means the Unitarian Theological School in close connexion with it, over which the President seems to regard himself as the presiding officer, and in which several of the University Professors are affording stated instruction ? And what mean those Unitarian streams perpetually pouring forth from the University on every side, to desolate the city of our God ?—In the present divided state of our Commonwealth, we do not ask that this institution should become exclusively Orthodox. We do not ask that there should be an entire change in its present officers of instruction. We do not ask or wish to turn out one sect, that we may put in another. But we wish to turn out sectarianism—the spirit of exclusion—and open the door for instructors of *any* religious denomination who may be duly qualified. We wish the institution to become, what it manifestly ought to be, the College of the state—that it may grow and prosper—that the whole state may patronise it—and that the number of those who enjoy its advantages may be greatly increased. We appeal to an intelligent public, if these wishes are not reasonable. And we call upon the good people of the Commonwealth, without regard to sect or party, to unite with us in urging them, and in using all proper means to hasten their accomplishment.

We repeat in conclusion, what we have already said : We have no desire to see our religious friends, the evangelical Christians of this Commonwealth, interested and engaged in political strife, or deeply concerned on questions of a political nature. We wish not to be obliged to call upon them to combine their forces, go to the ballot-boxes, and seek a redress of evils there. We prefer to exhaust all other probable methods of accomplishing the object, before we recommend a resort to this. Political preferment is not what we seek, either for ourselves, or for those who harmonize with us in our religious views. To be sure, we cannot see, any

more than Mr. Cooke, why there should not be a fair distribution of offices among the several denominations in the state. As "the Trinitarian denominations together comprise three fourths of the people," we cannot see, more than he, why "nine tenths of the political influence should continue in the hands of Unitarians." But let them treat us *fairly* and *justly*, and (as we said) we will not quarrel with them, or with any other sect, on this ground. They are in power, and let them rule us *impartially*, in the fear of God, and protect us in our dearest rights, and they may keep their seats without interference or molestation from us. But as we do not desire our rulers to treat us the better for our Orthodoxy, so we cannot consent to be treated the worse for it. The Societies of other denominations usually receive incorporation, when they ask it; and why should not ours? The churches of other denominations are not yet made the subjects of legal plunder; and why should ours be? We do not hear other denominations accused of treasonable designs against the State; and we cannot submit, without a shadow of evidence, to bear the odium of such accusations ourselves. It will be worse than vain, in this enlightened Commonwealth, to think of promoting one set of religious opinions, or putting down another, by political favoritism, or legislative enactments, or judicial decisions; for this is a people of many eyes, and such proceedings, if attempted, will certainly be discovered, and as certainly reprobated.

Our prayer for our civil rulers is, that they may be just and holy men, richly endued with that 'wisdom which is from above, which is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy;'—and for our Christian brethren, that they may have grace to bear, with becoming patience and moderation, whatever they may be called to suffer—committing their cause to Him who judgeth righteously, and who will assuredly overrule all events (not excepting even the purposes of the wicked) for the interest and glory of his church, and the honor of his holy name.

MISCELLANEOUS.

SENTIMENTS OF MINISTERS FORMERLY SETTLED IN AND AROUND BOSTON.

No people had ever more reason to revere their ancestors than the native inhabitants of Boston and the vicinity; and probably none ever exceeded them in professions of respect for those from whom were derived their existence and privileges. It is the more strange, therefore, that so many among this people have radically departed from the religion of their fathers, and are engaged in promoting a system of faith which those devoted men rejected, as erroneous and

unsafe. In tracing the progress of this revolution, we shall find it was accomplished, in some of its stages, by slow and almost imperceptible degrees. Each succeeding generation, while professing to follow the footsteps of its predecessors, gradually receded from their path, until, with many, nearly the whole compass of error has been traced, and they have learned to scoff at those holy doctrines, on which their fathers rested the hope of salvation.

It is not pretended by the liberalists of this day, that they agree in sentiment with the Pilgrims, the first planters of New England, or with those who immediately succeeded them in the care of these churches; but it is confidently alledged by the Unitarian clergy, and their people are instructed to believe, that they accord, in general, with their *more recent* predecessors, and are dutifully following in the steps of their faith. The names of Chauncy and Elliot, of Mayhew, Howard and Thatcher, and of many of their cotemporaries, are highly honored, as belonging to those who it is said were *liberal*, in the modern sense of the term, and cherished almost the identical faith of those who now minister to the same congregations.

Now we do not say that all those, whose names have been mentioned, or to whom we shall hereafter refer, were fully Orthodox in their religious opinions. Some of them had swerved not a little from the holy doctrines of their fathers, and were preparing the way for the defection which has followed. But we do say, and we design to shew, that they were an entirely different class of men from many now on the stage, who profess to be their admirers and followers. If they had departed from the principles of their fathers, modern Unitarians have departed still more widely and fearfully from their principles, so that they can properly claim no religious affinity with them. In shewing this, it will be necessary to present quotations from the writings of distinguished men, formerly settled in the ministry in this vicinity. We begin with Dr. Chauncy, long Pastor of the first Church in Boston.

DR. CHAUNCY.—“When the faith men are the subjects of is justifying, the true bottom of it is the testimony of God. They have a view of God, as speaking in the sacred books, different from what they had before. They don't now read the Scriptures merely as the writings of apostles, or prophets, but as the *writings of God*; and God as truly appears to them in these writings, as though he spake the things that are here wrote. And herein the persuasion of believers, that are in Christ, differs from that of others, who are not.”

“The things contained in the Scripture were wrote by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. They were received from God and *committed to writing, under his immediate, extraordinary influence and guidance.*”

The first thing observable in the text is, the gift spoken of; viz. the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit, as the word is elsewhere translated;—It is the name of the third of the sacred Three. He is otherwise styled, sometimes, by way of emphasis, the Spirit; sometimes the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of grace, the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of holiness; sometimes he is spoken of as the Comforter, the Sanctifier, and the like. That glorious person is pointed out, under all these appellations, in whose name, as well as

in the name of the Father and the Son, we are baptized, and by this instituted rite take upon us the character of Christians.

Only, let it be remembered, where the Holy Ghost is spoken of as a gift from God, we are not to understand hereby the *person*, but the *influences* of this blessed Spirit. Not that the Holy Ghost is nothing more than an emanation, operation or influence, from the Father. He is often represented in the Bible, as an agent, a person, as truly and properly so, as either the Father or the Son. But though he be a real, living, active, infinitely glorious person, yet, when he is spoken of as a gift, we are to understand hereby his *influence* and *operations*.

"Some, I am sensible, are for confining the gift of the Holy Ghost to the apostolic age; but there is no reason for this. 'Tis plain, from the current strain of the whole New Testament, that the gift of the Holy Ghost is as necessary for persons in all after ages, as it was in the first days of the Gospel. 'Tis therefore declared in language extending to all times as well as persons, 'Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'"

"Nor by the gift of the Spirit, in this sense, are we to understand barely the objective influence of revealed truths, or any improvements of nature that are merely moral; but that immediate presence and influence of the Holy Ghost, whereby a real power is communicated to the purposes of religion. This is the true meaning of those numerous texts, wherein those who are real Christians are said to be born of the Spirit; to have the Spirit dwelling in their hearts by faith; to be strengthened with all might in the inner man by the Spirit; to be led by the Spirit; to walk in the Spirit, and the like. By these phrases, is pointed out a sort of influence beyond what is merely natural or moral. 'Tis evidently their main scope to represent the Holy Spirit as all in all in the business of pure and undefiled religion; the beginner, the carrier on, and the finisher of faith, yea, and of every thing else that is spiritually good, in the hearts of sincere Christians. Nor will any thing short of this come up to the just and full import of these expressions."

"It is abundantly evident, from the general run of the New Testament writings, that our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, while in our world, "in fashion as a man," and "form of a servant," both did and suffered everything that was necessary in order to a worthiness, a righteousness, on account of which God might, in consistency with the honor of his perfections, and the authority of his law and government, manifest his mercy towards sinners, even the chief of them, in saving them from wrath, and admitting them to the joys of his presence in the kingdom of heaven."

"This finished work of Christ is that, with a view to which, for the sake of which, in consideration of which, the sinner is justified and saved. This is the expedient, this the moral mean, the wisdom of God, excited by his infinite benevolence, has contrived for the righteous and holy display of his grace towards the sinful sons of men, in discharging them from the demands of his law and justice. And whoever are made partakers of this grace, the obedience of Christ,

and eminently that finishing act of it, his willingly submitting to die on the cross, is the only meritorious ground of its bestowment. 'Tis not for the sake "of anything the sinner has about him" that he is acquitted from guilt, and accepted into favor. This is done by grace, through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ."

"If I know myself, I would always be in a disposition to love and thank Christ, for the great and gloriously benevolent work he finished on the cross; and next to the grace of God, it is, without all doubt, the grand requisite to justification. *Nor can we be justified without it.* 'Tis an essential part in the merciful plan God has laid, to save sinners from the damnation of hell."

"Another operation, included in the gift of the Holy Ghost, is the change whereby men are made new creatures. We every where read, in the inspired writings, of a change, which it is necessary sinners should pass under, as ever they would hope, according to the tenor of the Gospel covenant, to be admitted into the coming kingdom of God. This change is spoken of under a variety of names. 'Tis sometimes called conversion, sometimes regeneration, sometimes it is compared to a resurrection, and sometimes to a new creation. The same thing is intended in all these phrases; even that change which is made in men, when they become true Christians. Not that there is any change effected in them, physically speaking; their natural powers and faculties are still the same: But in the religious and moral sense, they are strangely altered. There is a change wrought both in their hearts and lives, in all their inward principles as well as outward behaviour in the world. They are, as it were, new moulded and fashioned. They have other thoughts and sentiments, other springs of action, other views and aims; they are so altered as to be quite other persons; they have another temper of mind, another taste and relish, another heart and soul, and they lead another kind of life, are pious towards God, righteous towards men, and sober in respect of themselves."

"This is the change we must pass under, in order to our being made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. And it is to effect this change, that the Holy Ghost is given. Nor can it be effected in any way but by his operations in us. It is not the produce of mere reason, nor of external revelation. It is not brought about by the bare influence of moral motives, whether they are fetched from the law or the Gospel: No, but it is an effect of the power of the Spirit, working effectually in them that believe."

"The apostle's reasoning, with respect to the unattainableness of justification upon the terms of law, ought to be considered as referring, not only to mankind as they existed at the time when he wrote, but in all after ages of the world. He most certainly wrote with a view to after ages as well as that in which he lived; designing to affirm and prove, that no son of man, in any age, till the end of time, could be justified upon law-terms: because, in the eye of law, they could not but be found guilty before God. And the plain truth is, his reasoning, upon this head, is as applicable to mankind universally in these days, as to mankind at the time when he wrote his epis-

tle. For it is as true now as it was then, and has all along been so, that they have universally sinned. Not that mankind, in all ages, have been sinners just in the same degree as in the apostle's days: But they now are, and always have been, and always will be, sinners in such a sense, as that it is impossible they should be justified by the rule of strict law."

"I may properly take occasion here to urge upon our young people a care to conform their external practice to the divine law. This, it is true, will not suffice to constitute you good men, in the estimation either of the law or gospel. If you go no further, you will still lack that which is absolutely needful. A mere external conformity to the law, will not argue that men are possessed of the "real power of godliness." There must be a "heart purified by faith," as well as the outward appearance of virtue in the life. But this, notwithstanding, a freedom from sin, especially in instances that are gross and heinous, is infinitely better than an allowed indulgence in vice and wickedness."

"The mission of his own Son from heaven into the world, to become incarnate, that he might, by being obedient to death, *make atonement for the sins of men* is the grand means by which this stupendous benevolence of the Deity, in the business of salvation, is carried into effect." "So far was the blood of Christ from being intended to work upon the heart of God, and stir up compassion in him, that it was love, and because he delighted in mercy, that he 'spared him not, but delivered him up for us all.' The incarnation, obedience, sufferings and death of Christ are therefore to be considered as the way or method in which the wisdom of God thought fit to bring into event the redemption of man. And a *most wisely concerted method it is.*"*

DR. WEST, *Pastor of the Church in Hollis Street, Boston.*—"The fallen, ruined state of human nature" is "a subject that should be much insisted on by the ministers of Christ. Christ is the remedy provided for the diseased and perishing souls of the children of men; but, alas, who will be solicitous for a remedy—who will inquire what he shall do to be saved, before he perceives himself *lost*? This is a subject of great importance: For though, after all, we acknowledge *it is the work of the Spirit to convince men of sin*, yet God is pleased to make the preaching of the word an effectual *means* of producing that conviction; and the word preached becomes, in the hand of the divine Spirit, like a hammer to break, or a sword to pierce the sinner's heart, bringing him, from a sense of his misery, to cry with the publican, 'God be merciful to me a sinner.'"

"Christ is to be considered as, in effect, all our salvation. We are not only accepted in the sight of God for his sake, but it is

* Chauncy's Twelve Sermons, pp. 95, 151, 163, 8, 322, Sermon on Enthusiasm, p. 7. Sermon on the Out-pouring of the Holy Ghost, pp. 6—11, 17. Treatise on the Benevolence of the Deity, published in 1784, pp. 166, 167.

Christ formed and brought forth in our hearts, that constitutes the *new nature*, makes us *new creatures*, and meet for the enjoyment of God in glory.”

“All have sinned, and come short of” the divine “glory.” *Jesus Christ has atoned for sin.* His Apostles were sent to proclaim the good news to mankind, and to confirm it by miracles, and his ministers in every age are employed to urge our acceptance of it. They all speak the same language, and this is the purport of all their preaching, ‘We pray you in Christ’s stead be ye reconciled to God.’”*

DR. ELLIOT, *Pastor of the New North Church, Boston.*—“The Scriptures make it plain, that there is such a thing as conversion. A man may be born again, and in a moral sense become a new creature.” “This happy change is not an effect of reason alone, nor of the doctrines and truths of Christianity in themselves considered. However adapted these are to awaken, enlighten, and renew sinful men, yet the Scripture teaches that they will not have this effect, *without the energy of the Spirit of God.* They who are born again, are said to be ‘born of the Spirit.’”

“There is no state a sinner can be in before conversion, but he may fall from it, and fail of the grace of God. It is not certain that any one, who is not inwardly renewed, will be kept from such apostasy as will be final. That which *secures a good man from a total defection from religion*, is not any impossibility in the nature of things that he should apostatize, but the power and grace of God, which a sincere Christian is assured will be employed to secure him.”

“I go on to observe, thirdly, the wise method God hath taken to show mercy to man, and at the same time show his infinite displeasure at sin. To inflict the punishment threatened would leave no room for mercy. To pardon the offender without any regard to the demands of the law would seem to be an encouragement to disobedience. In this state, God was pleased to make a way of reconciling the world to himself, *infinitely becoming him as governor of the world*—becoming his *goodness*, his *rectitude*, his *wisdom*. This was by appointing one to suffer in the room and stead of the sinner. The more innocent this substitute was, the more near and dear to God, the better would the ends of government be answered;—the more would God’s hatred of sin, his good will to sinners, and his high regard to his sovereign authority, be shown, by appointing him to this office. For this end, therefore, God constituted his Son to be a Prince and a Saviour—to make a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.”†

DR. APPLETON, *Pastor of the first Church in Cambridge.*—“If we would preach as the Apostle, we must preach up the necessity of Christ’s sufferings and death. And this will open a large field and give us great scope in our preaching. For in setting forth the

* Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Newell, pp. 15, 16, 30.

† Sermon at the Ordination of Andrew Elliot, Jr. pp. 17—19. Also Sermon on Redemption by the blood of Christ, in Elliot’s Vol. of Sermons, p. 217.

necessity of Christ's death, we shall be led to consider, the original state of man ; the covenant God made with him at first ; the *dreadful fall and apostasy of our first parents ; the sinful and wretched state they thereby brought themselves and their posterity into ;* and the innumerable actual sins that have proceeded from the corrupt fountain, and are consequent upon the first transgression. And so from these things, we shall be led to show how necessary it was for Christ to suffer and die, *in order to his making atonement for our sins, and satisfying the justice of God ;* so that he may, consistent with the honor of his perfections and of his law, pardon, justify and save repenting and believing sinners." "*There is no doctrine of the Gospel of greater importance to be preached, than the necessity of Christ's dying for us : To set forth that we were all brought into such a state by sin, original and actual, that there was no salvation to be had, but by a suffering and sin-atoning Saviour.*"*

DR. MAYHEW, *Pastor of the West Church, Boston.*—"There is no middle way for us between being saved and damned. As sinful creatures, we are already exposed to perdition from the avenging justice of God ; yea, *we are actually under a sentence of condemnation and death,* till such time as we are delivered therefrom, by having an interest in the redemption wrought out by Jesus Christ." "As sinners, we have forfeited all right to God's favor ; to any good whatsoever ; and are justly liable to wrath and punishment."

"Neither is it the question, whether a sinful creature can attain to true holiness, and so be entitled to eternal life, merely by any endeavors of his own, or without the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God. It is generally, if not *universally* agreed among professing Christians, that repentance unto life and evangelical holiness *are not attainable without the gracious operations of God's Holy Spirit ;* and consequently, that without these divine influences, all the endeavors of sinners to attain to holiness, and so to eternal life, must be ineffectual ; which indeed amounts to neither more nor less than what our Lord himself declares, that "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."†

DR. PEMBERTON, JR. *Pastor of the New Brick Church, Boston.*—"How desirable was the primitive state of man ! An enlightened understanding taught him the knowledge of God and his duty ; an uncorrupted heart inclined him to pay a perfect obedience to the mandates of his heavenly Father ; the way to unfailling felicity was open to his view ; every delightful enjoyment was in his possession. —But alas ! he rebelled against God ; and a melancholy change immediately ensued. His glory departed from him ; the privileges of his innocent nature were forfeited forever ; darkness veiled his mind ; pride and perverseness took possession of his heart ; the love of God was banished from his breast ; and self-love advanced to the throne. Man, the lord of this visible creation became an infa-

* Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Peabody, p. 16.

† Sermons on Striving to enter in at the Strait gate, pp. 26, 42, 43.

mous slave ; the favorite of his Maker a captive of hell. The heavens were armed with thunder ; the earth exposed to a lasting curse ; everything conspired to make the ungrateful rebel mortal, and miserable."

"What prodigies of love prepared the way for our restitution to our former happiness ! *A God became incarnate* ; the Lord of nature took upon him the form of a servant : the Prince of life suffered and died. Salvation is purchased at an infinite price, and freely offered to a lapsed world.—But this is not sufficient. The same goodness which discovers to us a Saviour must dispose us to accept of him in his sacred offices and characters. An omnipotent arm must be revealed to conquer our reluctant nature, or we shall voluntarily persist in the paths of perdition."*

MR. HAVEN, *Pastor of the First Church in Dedham*.—"In their preaching, ministers must treat on the person, and mediatorial offices of Christ. On his person as the Son of God incarnate, in whom *the Divine and human natures are united*. This is a mysterious doctrine. To explain the manner of this union may be beyond the power of any finite intelligence." Ministers will "treat of *Christ's death and sufferings, as a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of men* ; and illustrate the great doctrine of the satisfaction he made to the law and justice of God, which is the meritorious ground and foundation on which sinners are pardoned, justified and saved."†

DR. BYLES, *Pastor of the Church in Hollis Street, Boston*.—"The true Christian, holy as he is, and perfect as he endeavors to be, forever renounces his own righteousness, and stands perfect before God in the imputed righteousness of the Mediator." "This justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ is so evidently asserted and explained in the holy writings, that a man must be more cunning than ordinary who can persuade them to a different confession. No doubt the various racks of the critic, or the commentator (men who have a wonderful knack to illustrate away the meaning of the clearest texts, and explain them into nonsense) no doubt but the artificial engines of these men may pervert the plainest words, and extort half a dozen contradictions from every verse in the New Testament ; but however their ingenuity may please themselves, and gratify a few gentlemen of their own opinions, yet they will never be able to convince the sincere inquirer after truth, or weaken the authority of the inspired oracles, to a mind at the same time devout and rational."‡

MR. EBENEZER GAY, *of Hingham*.—"They (ministers) are in that right hand (of Christ) *which upholds all things*, and is able to keep them from falling ;—in that right hand, *which can do every thing* ;—in that hand, out of which none can pluck them ;—that

* Sermons on Salvation by Grace through Faith, published in 1774. pp. 82—84.

† Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Everett, pp. 10, 12.

‡ Sermon on the Character of the Perfect and Upright Man. p. 12.

hand that wieldeth and moderateth all things, and will overrule all to their safety and salvation;—in that right hand which doeth great things by them as instruments in it—getteth the victory over Christ's enemies, and maketh his people willing in the day of his power."*

PRESIDENT WILLARD, of *Harvard University*.—"The love of God and the Redeemer will frequently employ his (the good minister's) pen. In his discourses from the desk, he will direct the views of his hearers to Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for the sins of a guilty world, that he might be the great foundation of men's hopes."†

DR. THATCHER, *Pastor of the Church in Brattle Square, Boston*.—"For myself I can say, that I believe *the true and proper Divinity of Jesus Christ*; the awful depravity of human nature; the necessity of regeneration, and of the agency of the Divine Spirit in effecting this change; the insufficiency of our own works to justify us in the sight of God; our acceptance with him only on account of the merits and atonement of the Son of God; the necessity of holiness in heart and life in order to fit us for heaven; and the utter futility of the hope that in the future state, we shall have an opportunity of rectifying the mistakes, as to our religious character, which we make in the present."‡

DR. HOWARD, *Pastor of the West Church Boston*.—"The doctrines of the gospel respect mankind, not considered as innocent, but as apostate, guilty creatures, exceedingly prone to transgress, and for their transgressions liable to the curse of God."—"As to the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ, I would just observe,—that mankind in all ages seem to have thought that something of this sort was necessary, in order to the pardon of sinners, though they should repent, as appears from their use of various propitiatory sacrifices;—that the *goodness* of God is illustriously displayed in his providing a sacrifice, and receiving offenders to favor upon any terms, and his *justice* in requiring an expiation;—that no injury is done to Christ, since he *voluntarily* gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God;—and, in a word, that Almighty God, having chosen in this way to show mercy to his guilty creatures, *it would be highly absurd and impious in us to find fault with the scheme*, even supposing our imperfect understandings could discover no wisdom in it."||

DR. LATHROP, *Pastor of the Second Church in Boston*.—"God made them (mankind) upright, but they have sought out many inven-

* Sermon on the Seven Stars in Christ's right hand, p. 16. In a Sermon on "The Transcendant Glory of the Gospel, (p. 5.) Mr. Gay says, "Moses was a good man; *Christ was God as well as man*. Moses was not without sin; but Christ was holy, harmless, separate from sinners." &c. Mr. Gay is one of those whom the first President Adams, in his letter to Dr. Morse, declares were Unitarians.

† Sermon at the Funeral of Mr. Hilliard, p. 8.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Rowland, p. 20.

§ || Sermon on being Ashamed of the Gospel, pp. 12—14.

tions ;—they have *destroyed themselves*. When they lay exposed to the *just consequences of their own folly and wickedness*, their common Father had compassion on them ;—their righteous Sovereign entertained thoughts of mercy concerning them ;—he sent his first born Son to redeem and save them. The blessed Jesus left the realms of eternal glory—took upon him human nature—in the character of Mediator, *made an offering of his soul for sin—gave himself a ransom for all*—and having arose from the dead, sent his Apostles to proclaim the gospel of Divine grace to every creature.” “ Good ministers of Jesus Christ ” “ are employed to declare unto sinners—that *God hath found a ransom—that Christ hath died for them*, and that nothing is now requisite to their happiness, but a cordial subjection to that government which is committed to the great Redeemer. They are employed to woo and beseech transgressors to be reconciled to God.”*

MR. HILLIARD, *Pastor of the first Church in Cambridge*.—“ It (the gospel) brings us the news of an *Almighty Friend and compassionate Saviour, who came from heaven to deliver us from the condemning sentence of the Divine law*, and to restore us to the image and favor of our Maker.” “ St. Paul appears to have had the most exalted ideas of the peculiar and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel, when he says to the Corinthians, ‘ I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and *him crucified*.’ ” “ A minister, who confines himself to disquisitions on moral subjects, and neglects to urge the duties of religion by *evangelical motives*, may, perhaps, defend the systems of Socrates and Plato, but has forgotten that he was set for the defence of the gospel.”†

MR. ADAMS, *Pastor of the first Church in Roxbury*.—“ Ministers should be deeply concerned that they have the principles of holiness wrought in their minds ; that they be *born of God*, and be truly regenerate and sanctified men.” “ They should be concerned for what the Scriptures call a *new heart, a new spirit*, the seal of the Spirit of promise.” “ While ministers teach their people the necessity of being born of God, and call on them to examine whether the work of God is savingly begun, they should seriously inquire what evidences they have of such a work upon themselves.” “ What peace of mind can a minister enjoy, who is not in some good measure assured that he is a gracious man ? ”‡

MR. FRENCH, *Pastor of the South Church in Andover*.—“ How modestly and discreetly, and with what an humbling sense of his own weakness and unworthiness should a poor finite creature, a mere worm of the dust, who is crushed before the moth, treat upon the character of the infinite God ! With what wisdom and prudence should Christ’s ministers speak, when treating upon the sublime doc-

* Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Bentley, pp. 16, 20.

† Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Andrews, pp. 9—12.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Wyeth. p. 11.

trines of THE TRINITY, the perfections of the Deity, the decrees, providence, and sovereignty of God, and upon many other important truths, lest they should utter that which they understand not, things too wonderful for them which they know not?"—"Some to whom they are sent are in a state of unregeneracy, in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity; and some are real Christians. Some need the most solemn and awakening addresses, to rouse them to a sense of their guilt and danger; others, under the most fearful apprehensions of the wrath to come, may be ready to cry out, 'Sirs, what shall we do to be saved?'"*

DR. BARNARD, *Pastor of the second Church in Salem*.—"The principal actor in this great business (of redemption) is our Saviour Jesus Christ. And for the fullness of our comfort, hope, and assurance, we have him exhibited to us as 'the brightness of his Father's glory, the express image of his person,' *full of power and benevolence*; the design, therefore, cannot fail. For the executing it, we have him *taking on him flesh*, and dwelling among men.—It might be expected that the Ruler of the universe would exercise mercy to offenders in such a manner as shall give *no pretence to the rest of his creation to rebel in hopes of easy pardon, whatever their guilt may be*. The Christian salvation is a proof of the Divine wisdom in this respect. Therefore, we see the *incarnate Jesus* going on in such a series of consummate virtue and goodness as God might look on with pleasure, which being tried in the severest instances, and persevering even unto death, might be the proper basis of a grant of the highest blessings to him, in his *complex character*, and to men for his sake, and on his request. We see him *making peace by the blood of his cross, and redeeming us from wrath for without shedding of blood there was no remission.*"†

DR. OSGOOD, *Pastor of the Church in Medford*.—"Shall we understand by these (the unsearchable riches of Christ) the personal excellencies and glories of Immanuel? his character, offices, and work as Mediator, as *God manifest in the flesh*—having *all the attributes of Divinity*, and all the virtues together with the natural infirmities of *humanity* united in his person—this person appearing in the form of a servant, as *the substitute of sinners*, fulfilling all righteousness on our behalf, *dying of our sins*, rising again for our justification, ascending into heaven as our forerunner, and taking his seat at the right hand of the Father, as our constant and prevailing advocate? These things are mysteries of love and grace, unsearchable mysteries, into which the angels desire to look. They fill all heaven with wonder, and will be matter of admiration forever. These things *we know* St. Paul constantly preached, as articles of faith; though he did not attempt so to explain them, as to bring them, upon a level with the human understanding."‡

* Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Oliver, p. 10.

† Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Bayley, p. 12.

‡ Sermons at the Installation of Dr. Thatcher in Boston, p. 8.

DR. TAPPAN, *Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard University*.—"The unsearchable riches of Christ" may denote the "*personal excellencies of the Redeemer*." Thus understood, they point us to the wonderful assemblage of divine and human perfections in that mysterious Person, whose name is Immanuel, who is the image and effulgence of his Father's glory, in whom dwells all the fulness of the God-head, to whom the titles and attributes, the works and honors of divinity are ascribed; who yet was made flesh and tabernacled among us; who, amid the natural infirmities and temptations, exhibited all the virtues of humanity, in their full and steady lustre. What treasures of majesty and meekness, of dignity and condescension, of glory and humility, of justice and mercy, are united in his character! In his person and actions, combined with his discourses, the invisible God is brought down to man, that man might rise to the true knowledge, imitation, and enjoyment of God."

"To a creature burdened with conscious guilt, and acquainted with the perfect character and law of his Maker, how congenial, how welcome, is the Christian scheme of mediation. How consoling to hear that the Son of God has become the High Priest of offending man; that by his obedience unto death, he has completely vindicated and honored the divine government, and procured the full and everlasting forgiveness of every penitent sinner. It is the part of the evangelical preacher* to state this doctrine in its most simple and practical form; to point out its importance in the system of revelation, its correspondence with the present situation of man, with the general course of providence, and with the essential attributes of God. It becomes him to show, how admirably this expedient unites the pardon of relenting guilt, and the reward of defective virtue, with the public condemnation of sin, the improved order of the universe, and the most pure and exalted display of the divine glory. It becomes him to defend this doctrine from every imputation of absurdity, of injustice, or cruelty, by showing that the Father appointed, and the Son consented, to the death of the cross, from motives of the most tender, wise, and comprehensive love; that the good resulting from it will be unbounded and eternal; and that the pardon of offenders through this medium displays the divine benevolence in a manner far more extraordinary multiplied, and impressive, than if God had cancelled our guilt by *one single and sovereign act of grace*."

"This doctrine of the mediatorial obedience and sufferings of an innocent and glorious person for the benefit of the guilty, is not only a conspicuous feature in the gospel plan, but highly approves itself to those who have right apprehensions of God and themselves, and of the general constitution of nature and providence.—If, therefore, we believe in God, . . . shall we not believe the propriety and reality of vicarious suffering, as exhibited in the Gospel, the truth and importance of which are so amply attested, and which indeed is *explicitly interwoven with the whole scheme of Christianity*, and is supported by the same proofs with the system at large? Shall we not

* The Discourse from which this was taken was preached at the ordination of the Rev W. E. Channing, in Boston, June 1, 1803.

gladly receive, and even triumph in, the atoning sacrifice of Christ, when we have such evidence that God himself has appointed and accepted it, and when our own situation and feelings, as guilty, obnoxious offenders, concur with the general sense of mankind, in eagerly looking and crying for such an expedient? Shall our ungrateful and foolish pride spurn the benefit of this atonement, merely because we cannot comprehend all the reasons and ends of its appointment, or the precise manner in which it procures our forgiveness? Shall we dare, with atheistical blasphemers, to reproach this contrivance, as absurd and unjust, merely because it holds up God the Father as subjecting his meritorious and beloved Son to torment and death in the room of guilty mankind? Does not this reproach equally implicate the known and common proceedings of Divine providence? Is it not completely obviated by the voluntary consent of the Son of God to these vicarious sufferings, and the consequent glorious reward which he received for enduring them?

While the gospel thus provides a complete atonement, and pardon for our guilt, it offers and communicates the *sanctifying and comforting Spirit*, to purify and strengthen our natures, depraved and enfeebled by sin, and to restore them to moral rectitude and tranquillity. If we acknowledge God as the prime *efficient*, even in our common actions and enjoyments, shall we proudly disown our dependence on his gracious influence for those unspeakably greater blessings, which are implied in a truly virtuous and happy state of our souls? Shall we reject or ridicule the offered grace of the Holy Spirit, merely because we cannot comprehend the mode of his operation, when we are confessedly ignorant of the manner of Divine agency in the world of nature?*

From the numerous quotations here given, the intelligent reader will perceive, that the men from whose writings they are extracted—men eminent among the late clergy of Boston and the vicinity—were an entirely different class from leading Unitarians of the present day; and that the attempts of the latter to confound and identify themselves, as to principles, with the former, must be the result either of ignorance or artifice. The writers we have quoted believed, all of them, in the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, and all (with the exception of two or three, who were high Arians) in the supreme divinity of the Son of God. They all believed in the apostacy and depravity of our race; in the necessity of regeneration by the special influences of the Holy Spirit; and in the great doctrines of atonement, of redemption by Christ, and of justification through faith in his blood. With what propriety, then, do those now represent themselves as their admirers and followers, who openly reject every one of these doctrines, and decry some of them as impious and even blasphemous?†

* Works Vol. ii. pp. 250—252 and 315—319.

† With the quotations which have been given on the subject of atonement, our readers may compare, or more properly *contrast*, the following, from distinguished Unitarians of the present day.

DR. CHANNING.—“Suppose that a teacher should come among you, and should tell you, that the Creator, in order to pardon his own children, had erected a gallows in the centre of the universe, and had publicly executed upon it, in room of the offenders, an Infinite being, the partaker of his own Supreme Divinity; suppose him to declare, that this execution was appointed, as a most conspicuous and terrible manifestation of God’s justice, and of the infinite wo denounced by his law; and suppose him to add, that all beings

We call upon the inhabitants of Boston and the vicinity, who sit under the preaching of Unitarians, to look into this subject, to consider and ponder it. You are accustomed to hear such men as Pemberton and Elliot, Chauncy and West, Thatcher and Lathrop, Appleton, Gay, and Haven spoken of with great respect, as men of learning, piety and liberality, who understood and adorned their sacred profession, and taught the way of God in truth. They are the men by whom your fathers and mothers were instructed, and under whose instructions they were prepared, we doubt not, in many instances, for heaven. But do you know what the instructions of these men were? Do you know what doctrines they believed and taught? We do not say that they all agreed, in every point, with the Orthodox of the present day; for such is not the fact. But we do say, that they taught and enforced many of the essential doctrines of the Gospel.* We do say—and in proof of the assertion we refer you to their writings—that they taught a system of religion which, in all important particulars, you are now taught to reject and despise. They taught that all Scripture is given by divine inspiration, and is entitled to be regarded as the word of God. They taught that man is a fallen, corrupted, depraved creature, and needs to be renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit, in order to be admitted to the heavenly kingdom. They taught that Christ came down from heaven, assumed our nature and our flesh, and died upon the cross to make expiation for our sins; and that his atonement is the great object of faith, and the sole foundation of hope for fallen man. Are you taught these important doctrines now? Is this the way from earth to heaven which you are now directed and urged to pursue? Indeed we fear not. We fear that the foundation on which your fathers rested, the great truths, in the belief of which they lived and died, are not placed before you. We hear the atonement decried from the high places of your sanctuaries, as an abominable doctrine. We hear it asserted that “man is not created in a condition which makes an infinite atonement necessary;” and that “to build the hope of pardon on the independent and infinite sufficiency of Jesus Christ, is to build on in heaven and earth are required to fix their eyes on this fearful sight, as the most powerful enforcement of obedience and virtue. Would you not tell him, that he calumniated his Maker? Would you not say to him, that this central gallows threw gloom over the universe; that the spirit of a government, whose very acts of pardon were written in such blood, was terror, not paternal love; and that the obedience, which needed to be upheld by this horrid spectacle, was nothing worth?” Works, p. 423.

A. LAMSON.—“The spectacle of a sinless being stretched on the cross, to expiate the crimes of the wicked, or prepare the way for their forgiveness, far from inspiring a reverence for God’s moral attributes, is fitted effectually to weaken or destroy it. It would furnish as strong an argument of his injustice and cruelty, as could possibly be offered to our minds.”—“You talk to me of a substitute, &c. But, meanwhile, what a conception you have taught me to form of God! What a MONSTER you have held up as an object of my reverence and trust! Surely you do not ask me to repose confidence in such a being. I can view him only with *shuddering and horror*. The belief that he formed and governed the universe would be an *abhorred* persuasion, from which I would willingly take refuge in the LESS CHILLING CREED OF THE ATHEIST.”

Sermon at Danvers, pp. 15, 28.

* We have in this remark, and in the quotations by which it is supported, a full answer to the pretence so often urged, that because ministerial exchanges were promiscuous in this region, until within the last thirty or forty years, therefore they ought to be so now. In the days of our fathers, ministerial exchanges were indeed promiscuous, and with the utmost propriety. For although there were differences of opinion among the clergy, and some had swerved not a little from the faith of the Gospel, still they had not, at least in their preaching and profession, *abandoned* it. They continued to preach many essential, evangelical doctrines; and to have separated from them and withholden fellowship might, at that time, have been premature and unwarrantable. But the case is now so widely altered as to have become perfectly clear. The Orthodox and modern Unitarian systems of religion are essentially, radically, totally diverse; and for those who teach them to exchange services, must be regarded by all intelligent, impartial persons as incongruous and absurd.

an unscriptural and false foundation."† Your fathers certainly were not instructed after this manner; and if they were led in the right way, and (as you fondly hope) have gone to heaven, is there no reason to fear that yourselves and your children may be led in a wrong way, a dangerous, downward path, and so fail of the grace of life? This subject, we must be allowed to remind you, is too important to be lightly treated, or to be decided on the ground of party prejudices and feelings. It takes fast hold on eternity, and is momentous as the interests of the undying soul.

FACTS RESPECTING THE EARLY PROPAGATION OF UNITARIANISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The following extract from a communication in the London "Monthly Repository" (Vol. iii. p. 302) exhibits the state of feeling and the progress of Unitarianism in Boston and the vicinity, at the time of its avowal by Dr. Freeman and the congregation worshipping at the stone chapel.

Mr. (now Dr.) Freeman was a young man, when he was chosen by his church to be what they then called *their reader*. As he cherished a generous love of truth, and was courteous, sociable, and friendly, and always open to conviction, he became a member of the Bostonian Association of Ministers, who regularly assembled every Monday and freely conversed upon all subjects, every one declaring his sentiments without offending or being offended. Doctors Chauncy, Mather and Lathrop, and Messrs. Clarke, Everett, Eliot, and Smith, formed the principal part of that venerable band of brothers, who were true whigs of the old stamp, and who, whilst they displayed the most amiable manners in their mutual intercourse, were firmly united in Christian fellowship. They individually agreed to differ, and maintained this moral and truly religious principle, that *every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind*. Some of them, therefore, studied the writings of Priestley, whilst others of them to whom these writings were not so familiar, expressed no sort of enmity, when they incidentally heard what were the leading doctrines which he taught. Such was the state of things at Boston, in the year 1783. In that year, Mr. Freeman's congregation, who had been trained up in all the tenets of high-churchism, were solicitous to have him receive episcopal ordination. But he would not subscribe the 39 Articles, nor could he submit his conscience to the domination and capricious dictates of a bishop. The bishop therefore refused to engage in the service, to which Mr. Freeman, upon his own terms, would have gladly acceded. This conduct of the overseer led Mr. Freeman to think more deeply upon the subject than he had usually done. The affair became the topic of general conversation. Most of the Bostonians were advocates for Mr. Freeman. But, Mr. Parker, a high priest belonging to the first episcopal Church, exerted himself to the utmost against him, though with little success, as there was no establishment there, nor any Doctors' Commons, to punish him according to their arbitrary decisions."

"About this particular crisis, a gentleman from this country [probably the Rev. Mr. Hazlitt] embarked for America with his family.

† Channings Work's pp. 573, 575.

After spending some months in the southern States, he arrived at Boston the 15th of May, 1784 : and having a letter to Mr. Eliot, who received him with great kindness, he was introduced on that very day to the Association. The venerable Chauncy at whose house it happened to be held, entered into a familiar conversation with him, and shewed him every possible respect, as he learned that he had been acquainted with Dr. Price. Without knowing at the time any thing of the occasion which led to it, ordination happened to be the general subject of discourse. After the different gentlemen had severally delivered their opinions, the stranger was requested to declare his sentiments ; who unhesitatingly replied, that the people, or the congregation who chose any man to be their minister, were his proper ordainers. Mr. Freeman, upon hearing this, jumped from his seat in a kind of transport, saying, " I wish you could prove that, Sir." The gentleman answered, that few things could admit of an easier proof : and from that moment a thorough intimacy commenced between him and Mr. Freeman. Soon after, the Boston prints being under no *imprimatur*, he published several letters in supporting the cause of Mr. Freeman. At the solicitation of Mr. Freeman, he also published a scriptural confutation of the 39 Articles. Notice being circulated that this publication would appear on a particular day, the printer, apprized of this circumstance, threw off above a hundred papers beyond his usual number, and had not one paper remaining upon his hands at noon. This publication, in its consequences, *converted Mr. Freeman's Congregation into an Unitarian Church* ; which, as Mr. Freeman repeatedly acknowledged, could never have been done without the labors of this gentleman. A committee was appointed to reform the book of Common Prayer, and to strike out all those passages which savoured of Trinitarian worship. This object being pursued with great deliberation, the ordination of Mr. Freeman by his congregation did not take place before the end of the year 1788, and this congregation is now as flourishing, since it has learned to say *sumpsimus*, as it had formerly been under its old *mumpsimus*. Thus, then, 700 or 800 people, who had been accustomed to worship three Gods, and to believe one of these, as consisting of two persons, to be in reality two Gods, are now become so enlightened as to worship only the One God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

While the gentlemen referred to in this communication was at Boston, " he preached repeatedly there the Thursday's Lecture, and to many congregations in that city. He also preached at Dorchester, Jamaica Plain, Weymouth, Marshfield, Scituate, Providence, Salem, Hallowell, &c. At Old Hingham, where the venerable Mr. Gay was the Pastor, he preached above forty times, and the noble-minded general Lincoln was one of his 1200 hearers. The friendly and enlightened Mr. Shute was the minister of New Hingham, and Dr. Barnes the minister of one of the Marshfield Churches who was also a liberal man. Many other Churches might be mentioned, from which the Calvinistic gloom is gradually dispersing. But I must particularly notice Salem. There was there one thoroughdox congregation, which was not in a very flourishing state.

There were also three large congregations, where Unitarian ministers were generally heard with acceptance. One of these, indeed, became wholly Unitarian in a little time, through the fearless and indefatigable labors of Mr. Bentley, a very learned man, and an unbiassed and strenuous advocate for what appeared to him to be the good word of truth according to the gospel. The two others were mostly Arians. Mr. Barnard, an hospitable, open hearted man, who readily entered into the circumstances of a stranger, was the minister of the second of these churches, and had so well instructed his flock, that nothing was offensive to them which appeared to flow from an honest mind. Mr. Darby, a rich merchant, rendered the third respectable, by his courteous and bountiful disposition. Our friend often preached to these congregations, and was treated with civility by them all."

"People in this country cannot well conceive, what a rapid progress truth may make where there are no establishments, nor any temporal emoluments to fetter the mind against it. A little seed sown may be so productive in three or four years, as to furnish a supply to the greatest part of a whole country. There is every reason to expect that in thirty or forty years more the whole of Massachusetts will be Unitarian."*

MOSHEIM'S SERMONS.

The following extract from "Sermons on Important truths of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, by the late Dr. John Laurence Mosheim, Chancellor of the University of Gottengen," will be read with much interest. "Those," says Dr. J. P. Smith, from whom we copy the extract, "who know this eminent man (Mosheim) only by the translation of his Ecclesiastical History, are likely to have a very erroneous idea of his theological and religious character. He seems to have imposed upon himself a law of extreme reserve and apparent neutrality in writing his histories; and the English translator has added to the disadvantage, by giving him a tone and color resembling those of the infidel-philosophic school. The perusal of his other latin works would show that this opprobrium did not belong to him; but in the Discourses from which the following citation is taken, we see Mosheim's real character, as a *zealous, orthodox, practical, serious divine*."

"All men agree in this, that their powers of reason are not equal to the comprehension of every thing. It is universally admitted, that it would be but a mean token of wisdom for a man to say, 'This or that statement is not true, for I do not see *how* it can be.' No man, in the matters of ordinary life, would hold him a man of sense who should venture to say, 'There are no clocks or watches; for I do not know how such pieces of art can be made.' One might ask him, whether he knows how the sun promotes the growth of plants; and whether, if this be above his comprehension, he therefore denies the fact. What right have we to expect that truth should be found, without any mixture of obscurity, in the things of religion and man's eternal interest?

* More than thirty or forty years have elapsed since this prediction was uttered, and it seems no nearer its fulfilment now than it did then.

“ Yet, are not clearly revealed truths brought into doubt, because the manner of their being true is not known ? Is not such reasoning as this employed by many ; ‘ This or that doctrine is not true, because, when I take counsel with my understanding upon it, my ignorance is discovered ? ’—There are persons who deny the mystery of the TRINITY, and the truths connected with it. What has betrayed them into their lamentable errors ? Is it not, that they overlook that clear dictate of reason which I have been stating. The foundation of all their errors is their laying down this rule for themselves ; ‘ I must interpret those passages of scripture which are supposed to assert that doctrine, in some other way than the obvious meaning of the words appears to justify.’ But why ? ‘ Because my understanding cannot comprehend how there can be any kind of plurality in a sole and unchangeable Being : in other words, I believe that my understanding can comprehend every thing ; I believe that I have a right to reject any position, if I am not made acquainted with every circumstance about it.’

“ No man has authority to interpret the laws and appointments of any human government according to his own pleasure. No man has a right to turn aside the ordinances of the magistracy, till his own understanding is satisfied that they are convenient and agreeable to him. The lowest of mankind allow the truth of this : and are we to be told that no mysteries shall be admitted in religion ? That, if scripture is to be allowed at all the rank of a rule in matters of faith, it must be subordinated to the dictates of reason ? What is this excluding of all mysteries from the doctrine and service of God ! Is it not just this : that we will torture and murder many passages in the volume of revelation, till we find in them nothing but what our miserable wit shall not dislike ?

“ God has given us a holy revelation for our own benefit. In that revelation, he has, in plain and clear terms, declared some things which contain in them that which to our minds must appear surpassingly extraordinary and wonderful. Among other things he has said : ‘ God was manifested in the flesh : the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us : all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God.’ The terms are plain and clear ; but the things which they affirm are not equally so. What then ? Shall we refuse to pay that respect to these declarations of God, which we yield to the laws of earthly rulers ? Ought we not to reflect ; ‘ I am not at liberty to put what interpretation I please upon the revelation of the Supreme Sovereign. Though I do not apprehend every idea that belongs to these positions, yet I sufficiently understand that God knows the subject far better than all men put together. I will therefore receive the words as they are ; and for what I do not comprehend, I will wait for the light of eternity.—Yet men do the contrary of all this : and then give themselves out to be children of illumination !’

Letter from the late DR. STEPHEN WEST, of Stockbridge, to the REV. ASAHEL HOOKER, late of Goshen, Conn.

STOCKBRIDGE, 27TH JULY, 1804.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—I have read *Horne's Letters on Missions* with sensible feeling and pleasure. Candor, I think, will oblige us to view him in no other light, than that of a friend to Christ, and to the souls of his fellow men. The manner of his writing is warm, animated and striking. Many things said by him excited in me a sense of shame, and conviction of past great unfaithfulness. If a man like ourselves can paint the obligations of a Minister in such a light as to excite a blush in us while we read; what conviction of unfaithfulness to our glorious Lord and Master, may we expect that the light of eternity, and of the divine glory, will ere long, flash upon us! Surely, we all merit to hear, from our Judge, the awful reproof, "Thou wicked and slothful servant!"

That the Lord is preparing the way for his coming, we have every reason to believe. But who can abide the event? When he sits as a Refiner, how many of his professed friends, ministers as well as others, unable to endure the trial, will be found to be but dross! What evils are to precede the promised happy, peaceful state of the church, are known only to the Lord. We have every reason, however, to suppose that they will be sore and great. Satan will not lose his hold on the nations, without a mighty struggle. His power and arts are such, that none but the Almighty Saviour can break and confound them. I tremble for Britain; for the friends of Christ there, and for the success of their benevolent institutions for propagating the gospel among the dark and benighted nations. Yet we may confide in it, that Christ will be to them as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest. He sits upon the whirlwind, and guides the storm. How wonderful and infinitely incomprehensible must be the power and wisdom of that glorious Being, who guides and directs every purpose of every creature—every action, and word, and thought, which ever takes place in heaven, or earth, or hell—to one great and glorious end, the prosperity and happiness of his kingdom! Since *He* reigns, let us never be discouraged.

As to religion, I see no appearance of any revival of it in this place. Such is our pride, stupidity, and sottishness, that we merit to be eternally forsaken. But whatever becomes of us, we are sure that Christ knows all his elect by name; and can, and will, gather them all in.—His house will be filled; and every lively stone, necessary to the perfection and beauty of his glorious building, will be brought, and finally found in its place.

Mrs. West joins in affectionate regards to you, and to Mrs. Hooker.

I am, Sir, your Cordial Friend and Brother,

STEPHEN WEST.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, A. M.* Minister of Broad Mead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete edition ; with a brief Memoir of the Author. In two Volumes. New York : G. C. & H. Carvill. 1830.

We hardly need express the opinion, that these volumes form a valuable accession to our general and theological literature. They contain many articles which, to the mass of American readers, will be entirely new. A full account of them may be expected in a future number.

2. *Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry* ; addressed to the members of the Presbyterian Churches in the city of New York ; to which is prefixed a Letter on the present Aspect and Bearing of the Episcopal controversy. By Samuel Miller, D. D. Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. Second Edition. Philadelphia : Towar & Hogan. 1830. pp. 485.

3. *The Life of Mohammed* ; founder of the Religion of Islam and of the Empire of the Saracens. By the Rev. George Bush, A. M. New York : J. & J. Harper. 1830. pp. 261.

5. *Mental Discipline* ; or hints on the Cultivation of Intellectual and Moral Habits, addressed particularly to Students in Theology and young Preachers. By Henry Foster Burder, M. A. Third Edition, enlarged. To which is appended an Address on Pulpit Eloquence, by the Rev. Justin Edwards, D. D. ; also a course of study in Christian Theology, by the Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D. New York : J. Leavitt. Boston : Crocker & Brewster. 1830. pp. 254.

5. *The Scriptural Directory to Baptism* ; being an Examination of the principal Passages in the Old and New Testaments relating to the Mode of administering this Ordinance. By a Layman. New York : D. Fanshaw. 1830. pp. 45.

6. *An Essay on the State of Infants.* By Alvan Hyde, D. D. Pastor of the Congregational Church in Lee, Mass. New York : Cornelius Davis. 1830. pp. 12.

The subject of this Essay is discussed under the three following propositions ; 1. Infants are *immortal* beings. 2. They are *moral agents*, and possess *moral characters*. And 3. They are *sinners*. Dr. H. supposes that infants, from the first, have moral exercises, "partaking, though in a low degree, of a moral quality,"—and that these exercises are selfish and sinful.

7. *The connexion between the Duties of the Pulpit and the Pastoral Office* ; An Introductory Address delivered to the members of the Theological School in Cambridge, October, 1830. By Henry Ware, Jr. Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. Cambridge : Hilliard & Brown. pp. 28.





